King James Onlyism VERSUS Scholarship Onlyism



DR. PETER S. RUCKMAN

KING JAMES ONLYISM
VERSUS
SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM

A detailed account of how the minds and ministries of five thousand Bible-believing young men were destroyed in Conservative and Fundamentalist Colleges, Universities and Seminaries between 1880 and 1990.

Other Materials Available

***

By Dr. Peter S. Ruckman:

* Bible Believer's Commentary Series
* Beginning and Advanced Bible Study Material
* In-Depth Apologetics
* Numerous Pamphlets on Selected Topics
* Variety of Gospel Tracts
* Audio Cassettes
* Video Cassettes

Also Available:

* AV 1611 Bibles
* Study Helps
* Concordances
* Biographies
* Evangelism Material
* Material by Other Authors and Speakers

***

King James Onlyism versus Scholarship Onlyism

BY

PETER S. RUCKMAN
B.A., B.D., M.A., Th.M., Ph.D.

BB BOOKSTORE
P.O. Box 7135 Pensacola, FL 32534

Reprinted 2007

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The Scripture quotations found herein are from the text of the Authorized King James Version of the Bible. Any deviations therefrom are not intentional.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

"King James Onlyism" was a cliche (like "Ruckmanism") invented by the faculty and staff of the school where I got my M.A. and Ph.D.: Bob Jones University in Greenville, S.C. After placing a hidden placard on the pulpit of their chapel platform saying, "Use *only* the *King James Version* from this pulpit," and declaring at "The World Congress of Fundamentalism" (1990) that the only English version used there would have to be the *King James Version,* this desperate bunch of professional deceivers decided that "King James Onlyism" was a *deadly heresy* that came from a "cult."

Bob Jones Jr. and Bob Jones III (1960-1980) thought it cute to add an "ism" on both the expressions above to scare Bible-believing Christians out of their faith in the Book. Then they would be accused of "following a man" and be identified with a "cult." Very few Christians stopped to THINK for a moment about the innovative expression, for the only substitute for "King James Onlyism" for an American would be "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM." I mean, a Christian is supposed to have some final authority by which he makes decisions and settles issues. If it was NOT the *King James Bible,* what would it be? Few American Christians stopped to think about this crucial question; and it was absolutely crucial, for it dealt with FINAL AUTHORITY which, from the dawn of recorded history (Gen. 3), has been THE ISSUE with mankind.

To cover up their devilment and their true designs,

the apostates offered the Bible-believer a substitute for his Book. They offered him a pile of lost scattered pieces of paper ("original autographs") written in a dead language that he *could not understand* unless he *attended* ($$$) a school like theirs ($$$). Thus "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM" became his *substitute* for the Holy Bible—the *Authorized Version of* the English Protestant Reformation. This threw the hat *of* final authority into the ring for "grabs," because scholars vary from demoniac atheists and unsaved agnostics to Roman Catholic monks and Conservative "Evangelicals." Final authority was reduced, by Bob Jones University, to opinions and preferences, with the arbitrator of conflicting opinions and preferences being the opinions and preferences of the scholars who conflicted with each other. Anarchy. *Relativism;* pragmatic humanism. (If you want some "isms," there they are.)

This booklet shows you how the cult *of* "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM" operates (and has operated for one hundred years) in order to destroy the Holy Bible as the final authority in YOUR life. In this book, all *of* the conservative scholars assume the seat *of* final authority, and all sit in judgment on the BOOK. This Alexandrian Cult is composed *of* "gods" (Gen. 3) who partook of **"the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,"** so they freely *question* what God said (Gen. 3:1), *subtract* from what He said (Gen. 3:2), and *add* to what He said (Gen. 3:3). Their final authority is their own opinion. This shows the FRUITS and RESULTS of this type *of* "Funnymentalism." At the end *of* the book, "Scholarship Onlyism" is applied in a real situation, and you see it in actual operation as carried out by a saved "Fundamentalist." Its fruits are one hundred percent error, while professing to have the ability to find error in ALL translations and ALL Greek texts.

"KING JAMES ONLYISM" VERSUS "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM"

The average Christian in America (professing or possessing) can never get a clear picture of what goes on behind the closed doors in a Christian Seminary or University in America for the simple reason that you have to attend the classes held there to find out what is going on. All is "above the head" of any Christian who is not "called to preach," or at least "feels led" to investigate the "deeper things" of the Scriptures. The graduates of these Seminaries and Colleges (say, Tubingen, Cambridge, Fuller Theological Seminary, Grace Theological Seminary, Bob Jones University, Furman, Judson, Liberty University, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Baylor, Dallas Theological Seminary, Princeton, Tennessee Temple, Stetson, Gordon-Conwell, etc. Same crew, different professions) come off their chapel platforms with their mortar-boards and degrees as experts in the Alexandrian Cult: elite tradesmen, majoring in the trade terminology (see *The Anti-Intellectual Manifesto,* 1991); human beings just a little short of "gods" (Gen. 3:1–5), fully equipped to get all Christians to place their confidence and trust in **"wisdom of words"** (1 Cor. 1:17,19) as given to them in the institution from which they graduated.

The educational idea behind all of this is uniform in all institutions of "higher learning," including all of the secular and state Universities and Colleges in North America. The educational goal is to destroy the belief in ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY coming from God and

put, in its place, the relative authority of man, composed of the preferences and opinions of men who consider *themselves* fully equipped to be your guide instead of the Holy Bible itself. In this respect, the goals of BBC, the University of Chicago, PCC, Santa Rosa Christian Schools, New York City College, Pacific Coast Bible College, Harvard, Bob Jones University, and Berkeley (Calif.) are identical.

The *motive* behind this educational conspiracy is self-preservation (an animal instinct) and the **"love of money"** [1 Tim. 6:10] and recognition [Jude 16] carnal instincts). The fact that some of the professors are saved (while some are lost) or that the student body does or does not follow a "dress code," or the fact that some professors say they believe in the authority of a lost pile of papers no one ever read, is immaterial to the RESULTS of their scholarship; the *results* are the Laodicean apostasy of 1880–1980 and the nearly total destruction of Biblical Christianity in America (see *The Damnation of a Nation,* 1991).

All of the weeping and wailing today from pastors and evangelists about "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" and "We can have revival now!" and "If my people which are called by my name . . . etc.," doesn't affect anything. The crime rate doubles every other year, the divorce rate tripled in less than ten years, and the "war on drugs" looks like the "militant stand of BJU" for the Bible, or a Congress of Fundamentalists trying to bring revival to Paris or Naples. It isn't just pathetic, it's a looney bin.

Now, we thought you might like to step inside a Seminary—any Seminary: Evangelical, Fundamental, Liberal, Catholic, or Conservative—and see what goes on before your "pastor" is able to get into the pulpit and "share" some "reliable translation" with you. I will introduce you to our faculty members who are

here to "help us understand the Word of God" more perfectly and only desire to transmit to us "the original intent of the original author" (not meaning God, but Peter, James, John, David, et al.).

I have purposely picked the most up-to-date, modernized, and thoroughly trained faculty in the world. These men studied in the Canadian Theological Seminary in Regina, Saskatchewan, the University of Manchester, Wheaton, Moody, Fuller, Baylor, The University of Wales, Harvard Divinity School, Fort Wayne Bible College, Trinity Evangelical School, the University of Aberdeen, Cambridge, Marburg, Dallas Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids Bible College, the University of Nottingham. Beeson Divinity School, Grace Theological Seminary. Florida Southern College, Criswell College, the University of North Texas, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Regent College, Denver Seminary, Ausustana College, Point Loma Nazarene College, Trevecca Nazarene College, the University of Basel. The University of Bristol, and Princeton. Many of these men agree completely with Bob Jones Jr. and Bob Jones III on final authority, manuscript evidence, modern translations, and "the fundamentals." We will skip Jerry Falwell at this point. (His school was documented well enough in *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* and *The Last Grenade* (1989) to last them for a lifetime.)

Don't let the term "EVANGELICAL" bother you. Curtis Hutson (a regular speaker at PCC and BJU) served on the overview committee of a new translation along with the founder of Neo-Evangelicalism (Harold Ockenga).[1]

Our elite tradesmen from the Alexandrian Cult are as follows:

1. Dr. Davids, *Canadian Theological Seminary.*
2. Dr. A. T. Robertson, *Louisville Theological Seminary.*

3. Dr. Hanger, *Fuller Theological Seminary.*

4. Dr. John R. Rice, former editor, *Sword of the Lord.*

5. Dr. M. W. Holmes, *Bethel College.*

6. Bob Jones III, President, *Bob Jones University.*

7. Dr. S. McKnight, *Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.*

8. Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield, *Presbyterian scholar.*

9. Dr. Boyce Blackwelder, *Anderson College,* Indiana.

10. Dr. G. R. Osborne, *Trinity Evangelical School.*

11. Dr. Stewart Custer, *Bob Jones University.*

12. Dr. D. A. Black, *The Lockman Foundation.*

13. Dr. Bruce Lackey, *Tennessee Temple University.*

14. Dr. D.E. Garland, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.*

15. Dr. D. L. Bock, *Dallas Theological Seminary.*

16. Kenneth Wuest, *Moody Bible Institute.*

And then, to be of further help to you—so you will never get ensnared in the damnable heresy of "King James Onlyism!"—I have called forth Doctors A. B. Spencer, M. C. Parsons, M. R. Mullholand, B. Stancil, K. Snodgrass, R. B. Sloan, J. W. McCant, C. L. Blomberg, C. R. Wells, L. T. Lea and D. S. Dockeryd (Broadman Press).

Now, isn't that a beautiful line up? Not only do we have Fundamental representation (The Lockman Foundation, *NASV*) to back up Bob Jones University and Conservative representation (Dallas Theological Seminary) to back up the *NIV,* but also the Southern Baptists (*NIV, RSV,* and *NKJV*) to back up Criswell and Truett. Then also, we have Neo-Evangelicals (Fuller and Wheaton), to promote the *NIV* and the *NRSV,* and

the Independent Baptists (Tennessee Temple). Observe that many of these "reverent Biblicists" and "godly scholars" and "qualified authorities" studied in England and on the Continent. How could anyone crack-up with such a "crew" in charge of the "strato-liner"?

We are now going into the classroom to study that to which YOUR preacher had to be exposed in order to "earn" a higher theological degree of some kind. He might not have taken all the courses about to be described, but he will have had to sit at the feet of apostates who took them—apostates, as will be seen, upon whom a great deal of humanistic GARBAGE was dumped before they were hired as teachers. Where Pensacola Christian College, Bob Jones University, and Baptist Bible College AGREE with the material we are about to study, we will indicate it with an ASTERISK (*). (Modern apostate Fundamentalists are sometimes only thirty percent "Liberal"; at other times ninety-five percent.)

The reader should understand that what he is about to read is the material delivered to a young man who is "called to preach" or "called to teach." Throughout all, he must be conscious of an age-old maxim, otherwise none of what he is about to read will make very much sense. Time after time in sitting "at the feet" of these "serious students of the Scripture," he will be tempted to think, "In the name of God, why do they go to all of this trouble to deal with a Book in which they don't even believe? Why do they devote their lives and 'ministries' to attacking one Book? If they didn't believe its contents, why didn't they just leave it alone and find a book they *believed,* or at least write a book they could believe."

You will notice that not one man in the list (or one school in the list, or any man or school who believed what they taught) wound up believing ANY-

THING except occasionally some basic truth from the Nicean Creed or the Apostles' Creed (A.D. 200–400), while rejecting the SOURCE from which these beliefs came. Here one finds such a monumental expenditure of energy on a hopeless and useless project that it would cause an ecologist or environmentalist to have a coronary.

The maxim the "layman" must keep in mind is simple: "They cannot leave the Book alone because it will not leave *THEM* alone." That one maxim must be remembered for the next ninety pages, or the reader will "grow dull of hearing." What he is about to read doesn't "make sense" in any sense of the term "common sense." It is obviously nothing but a gigantic educational superstructure erected by professionals ($$$) for the purpose of nullifying the authority of one Book (Mark 7:9, 13; 1 Thess. 2:13) and turning loose on the Body of Christ a mass of "shepherds" who are just as blind as a bat, as powerless as a kitten, and just as deadly to true knowledge of the Book as a Bible study conducted by Jim Jones or Ted Kennedy.

The *plan* behind the Christian educational conspiracy (1886–1980) was simply to destroy every local church in Europe and America by undermining the authority of the BIBLE in the *minds* of the *pastor* first and then of the *congregation* to whom he "ministered." This conspiracy was carried out by Conservatives, Evangelicals, and Fundamentalists between 1880 and 1980. The first man to hit the skids would have to be the pastor. He would be the "skipper" of the craft, so he would have to encourage the congregation to sink it.

So here we step into his school for "training shepherds and skippers" and see what he was taught. We shall make remarks as we go to show the reader the vast credibility gap that exists (and has always existed)

between higher Christian education and the Holy *Bible*. These remarks will be Scripture comments on the stupidity and infidelity of the "good, godly" men listed above. They will be given to show the reader that one of two things goes wrong about fifty times a day in every major Christian Seminary and University in the country.

One: The professor is so ignorant of the content of the Book he is teaching that he doesn't even know when it has corrected his own blunders or made a plain liar out of him.* Two: The professor, in his own mind, has successfully nullified anything in the Book contrary to his own lusts and opinions and is **"making the word of God of none effect"** (Mark 7:7–13) by one of the scholarly disciplines which he was taught or is teaching: Form Criticism, Textual Criticism, Canonical Criticism, Literary Criticism, Archaeological Discoveries, New Testament Greek Grammar and Modern Linguistics, Manuscript Evidence, Redaction Criticism, Greek Grammar, Source Criticism, Form Criticism, Systematic Theology, "Structuralism," New Testament Interpretation, or Biblical Introduction.

Some basic Biblical fundamentals, that deal with such education, wisdom, intellectual curiosity, divinity, authoritative verbal commands and "higher learning," are found in Genesis 2, 3; Isaiah 28, 20; Psalms 119; 1 Corinthians 1–3; and Proverbs 8, 18, 30. These should be MEMORIZED by any layman who wishes to escape the "plague" being spread today by Christian Colleges, Universities and Seminaries (of any profession). These basic fundamentals show that the "Author" of the Scriptures (GOD) wishes you to know seven things, and these seven things will be obscured to the maximum extent in the material we are about to examine (which actually covers more than six hundred pages, using the works of more than three hundred

"qualified Christian authors").

1. There is a Devil (Satan), and he is primarily interested in what GOD says.

2. When deceiving someone, two-thirds of what he says is true.

3. His approach is always critical so that it poses QUESTIONS.

4. He aims at a man's pride and curiosity to get him to add to, or subtract from, what God said.

5. His aim is to make man his own "god" so he can deify his own opinions and preferences, thereby becoming his own authority, standing against God's authority.

6. He appeals to impressive vocabularies and educated "positions" to impress the uneducated with the necessity of getting rid of the Book and replacing it with *anything* ("reliable translations," Hebrew and Greek lexicons, "original autographs," the opinions of "good, godly" men, etc.).

7. God reveals nothing to any man because of that man's head knowledge of anything. The key to understanding the Bible, or the Author of it (God), is *A BELIEVING HEART AND A HUMBLE MIND.* Formal education is an addenda or a "minor" which may, or may not, help in attaining this knowledge. As we shall see in what follows, higher formal Christian education is probably the greatest hindrance to understanding the Bible of anything in which a young man could get involved, outside of Satanism and Black Magic.

I. "NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION"

The course is a joke. Under the guise of "discovering the MEANING of the writings of the New Testament," the student is given Irenaeus as "the father of authoritative exegesis in the church" (A.D. 130–200) and then has his attention called to Clement and Origen in Alexandria (A.D. 150–215 and 184–254). These

Alexandrians are presented as truth seekers who "led the soul into a realm of TRUE KNOWLEDGE where the vision of TRUTH could be discovered."[2]

1. Irenaeus was a teacher of baptismal regeneration.

2. Irenaeus said that Peter preached in Rome and Mark was his "interpreter."

3. Irenaeus said that the original Gospel of Matthew was written in Aramaic so the word *Cephas* (*Peter*) would match **"rock"** (Matt. 16:18).

4. Irenaeus said that Rome is the greatest church of all because it was founded by Peter and Paul (*History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. 1, p. 63).

This is the "FATHER of *authoritative* (Gen. 3:1) exegesis in the church."[3] Well, yes, if it is the church of the firstborn in Hell.

1. Clement and Origen never professed a conversion experience a day in their lives.

2. Both associated water sprinkling with regeneration.

3. Origen taught there was no literal physical resurrection (Acts 17:32) and that THE DEVIL would eventually be saved.

4. Neither man believed in the restoration of Israel; both men believed Genesis 3 was a *myth.*

5. Origen rejected Premillennialism, although it was being preached during his entire lifetime. "The realm of TRUE knowledge," was it? Well, yes, if you are someone trying to "trip" on cocaine or crack.

You will then be told that Antioch did not follow Origen, nor did they follow Jerome (A.D. 341–420) or Augustine (A.D. 354–466). The latter emphasized "the Biblical canon whereby a text was interpreted in its larger context . . . validating SPIRITUALIZED INTERPRETATIONS so that the historical meaning remained primary."[4]

1. Jerome taught that Peter committed a sin in *getting married.*

2. Jerome adopted Origen's Alexandrian text (via Eusebius at Caesarea) for the New Testament, thus getting rid of the Antiochian text where the disciples were first called **"Christians"** (Acts 11:26).

3. Augustine approved of imprisoning and killing the Baptists of his day (Donatists).

4. Augustine taught the Second Coming of Jesus Christ occurred every Sunday morning on Catholic altars, with "Jesus" showing up one bit (or bite) at a time in a wafer.[5]

5. Augustine taught an absolute predestination which is controlled by the Catholic sacraments; i.e., the baby is "elected" if you sprinkle it quickly enough.

6. The fruits of adopting *Jerome's* version—which contained the Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament inspired canon—were THE DARK AGES.

"A balanced hermeneutic" emerged that impacted hermeneutical practices in the Middle Ages . . . ."[6] Well "balanced," yes, if you have the mentality of Gary Heidnik (circa 1971–1988, a young man who kidnapped women, raped and tortured them, and then burned or froze their corpses).

You understand that the name of this seminary course is *"New Testament Interpretation,"* don't you?

The next thing is the "fourfold approach" (John Cassian, A.D. 433, and Bernard of Clairvaux, A.D. 1090–1153) which states that all Catholics should believe the allegorical method of Alexandria in order to believe correctly. Thomas Aquinas (1224–1274) demonstrated "that the spiritual sense of Scripture was always based on the literal sense and derived from it," and "he equated the literal sense as the meaning of the text intended by the author."[7]

1. So he *approved* of the Inquisition and autho-

rized the torture and burning of Christians at the stake, as witches.

2. Infants are detained in Hell for the sin of Adam.

3. There is no restoration of Israel, no Millennium, no Rapture, no Tribulation, and no Judgment Seat of Christ.

4. The Catholic Church can save or damn anyone by refusing water sprinkling for them.

5. Bernard preached the Second Crusade; and when it turned into a slaughter, the desperate, lying hypocrite said, "Was Moses to blame in the wilderness, who promised to lead the children of Israel to the promised land? Was it not rather the sins of the PEOPLE which interrupted the progress of the journey?" (*History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. 1, pg. 283)

Now, have you grasped something yet? Here we are taking a "historical survey" of New Testament Interpretation, and every time we "survey" it, our teacher pretends that deliberate perversions of more than five thousand verses in the Bible, which deal with the main subject of the Bible (the Second Advent), are to be overlooked or taken lightly. Matthew 13, 24, and 25; Luke 17, 21; Joel 2; Psalms 68; Mark 13; Zechariah 14; Romans 8; Acts 3; 1 Corinthians 15; Amos 9; 1 Thessalonians 4; 2 Thessalonians 2; 2 Timothy 3; and Revelation 1–19 deal with the Second Advent. Not a man listed, so far, with the exception of Irenaeus, was a Premillennialist, and Irenaeus was so screwed up on church history and Biblical truth that he couldn't get you to Heaven with fifty Bibles. Not one man listed so far was right on the New Birth, and not one man listed so far abandoned the *allegorical methods* of the Alexandrian Cult when he found anything in the Bible he could not understand.

Your future "pastor" (more than five thousand since 1800) is being prepared to "pastor," and he hasn't

even gotten into Manuscript Evidence yet!

When your future "pastor" gets to Reformation Hermeneutics, he runs into Luther (1483–1546), John Colet (1466–1519), Erasmus (1466–1536), and Calvin (1509–1564). He is now told that Erasmus and Colet rediscovered the "priority of the literal sense."[8] They did nothing of the kind. They used the correct Latin (Old Latin, not Jerome) and the correct Greek (Antiochan-Syrian texts) for publishing Bibles, but neither man believed that ONE verse of Revelation 13; Job 40, 41; Isaiah 34; Matthew 25; or Revelation 20 was literal. Erasmus' "hero" was *Origen.*[9]

You are then told that Calvin "was the greatest exegete of the Reformation . . . focusing the place of meaning in the historical interpretation and developing the spiritual message from the text." Your future pastor will be given the "works" at this point. Calvin was a scholarly LECTURER; "indeed in the eyes of some he is regarded as the greatest *interpreter* in the history of the Christian Church."[10]

1. Blasphemy against Genesis 40:8, 41:16; Daniel 2:19–23; and Luke 24:45. *Not one man listed in the first three pages of this book would know that, nor could he find it out.*

2. The "greatest interpreter" tried to establish a Jewish theocracy in Geneva using the Old Testament laws of Exodus 21:17, 22:18, and Deuteronomy 21, which were nailed to the cross (Col. 2:14). This led him to have Christians executed for slapping their parents, and theological opponents *burned at the stake.*

3. Calvin taught the damnation *of unelected infants,* baptismal regeneration by sprinkling, and Amillennialism.

4. Calvin was a "Protestant Pope" who taught that the New Birth took place BEFORE repentance and faith in Christ, and that the New Birth could be *condi-*

tioned by sprinkling in a "Reformed" or "Presbyterian" church. "The greatest interpreter," was he? Well, yes, *if you* are a deaf mute and can't read.

The history of "interpretation" takes your aspiring pastor through Post-Reformation Scholasticism, Pietism, and Rationalism. And from there, he goes off into Bengel, Semler, Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza, Lessing, Reimarus, Scheiermacher, and Co.; and, lo and behold, what began with Irenaeus and Tertullian winds up with UNSAVED GERMAN RATIONALISTS (Griesbach, Storr, Paulus, Wrede, Bultmann, et al.), leading Westcott and Hort to produce the RV of 1885![11]

Thus, your "pulpit replacement" is led to the Nestle text of the *NIV* (which is published by Aland and Metzger) and appears as an *NRSV* or an *NASV* in Christian Colleges and Seminaries in the Twentieth Century. The sucker was taught that J. Semler and Johann Ernesti come through Eichhorn and Michaelis to Lachmann, Holtzmann, Farmer, and Orchard; and then Bauer and Gabler bring you on up to Westcott and Hort, with the help of Charles Hodge and Jonathan Edwards!*

This is *"NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION."*

At the end of this godless excursion into cloudland—which *had nothing to do with either Testament—you* are recommended books by K. L. Schmidt, M. Dibelius, Bultmann, Conzelmann, W. Marxen, G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, Grant Osborne, and H. J. Held. To make sure you learn NOTHING from the New Testament and learn no plan for finding out ANYTHING from it, you are referred to Bruce Metzger (*The New Testament Canon*), R. A. Culpepper (*Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*), and Paul Duke (*Irony in the Fourth Gospel*).

Any *one* book by Clarence Larkin (1929) has more correct Old Testament and New Testament "interpretation" in it than the entire works of any TEN men men-

tioned in the last three paragraphs.

Today, every school listed in this book is engaged in supposedly "progressive work" along the lines of New Testament interpretation. This muddled, confused mass of irrelevant nonsense is called "recent developments," and means nothing except the whole mass of deceived tradesmen are still reexamining each others theories and inventing "new" theories for their own kind to "reexamine" later. There was no progress since *Origen* (A.D. 254) apart from the work of men who got common ordinary people interested in READING their Bibles or got them interested in going by what the Book SAID instead of what the Catholic hierarchy claimed it "taught."

II. "TEXTUAL CRITICISM"

Having been completely seduced and deceived into thinking that it was the "intelligentsia" who brought about "correct interpretation of the New Testament" between A.D. 100 and 1900, the sucker is now ready to listen to the "intelligentsia" instead of the Scriptures. He is now going to be taught "textual criticism."

The first gas bag he will get is that there is an "embarrassment of riches" (a standard Alexandrian cliché used to preface a lie) about "sources," so you will be deceived into thinking the teacher will follow the majority of sources—which he is going to do except when he doesn't feel like it.* Then the chump will learn there are "text types" and these types prove "family" or "genealogical relationships." Having swallowed this, the young man is given a chart[12] showing how TWO manuscripts (Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) can outweigh *FIVE HUNDRED* manuscripts.* Those who believed this were the faculties and staffs of twenty-four fundamental Colleges found in the appendices of *Problem Texts* (1978), and forty more printed in the *Bible Believers' Bulletin* (October, 1991). Among them, Ten-

nessee Temple, Bob Jones University, Wheaton, Fuller, Pillsbury, Moody, Mid-South Freewill Baptist College, King's College, Dallas, BIOLA, and Denver, Broadus, Carroll, Criswell, Robertson, Wuest, Zodhiates, Hodges, Warfield, Machen, Noel Smith, and Bob Jones Jr., swallowed this line—hook and sinker with it.

This produced the official Roman Catholic Dark Age Bible (Jesuit Rheims) for American "Fundamentalists," in the form of an *ASV* (Conservatives), NASV (Fundamentalists),* *RSV* (Liberals), *NRSV* (Women Libbers), *NIV* (Evangelicals), and *NKJV* (which retains the English texts of the *ASV, NASV,* and *RSV* while denying the Greek text from which it came). The documentation of this FACT is found in three thousand pages printed in *The Christian's Handbook of Christian Scholarship; Problem Texts; Satan's Masterpiece, the New ASV; The NIV, an In-depth Study in Apostasy; Which Bible?* by David O. Fuller; and *The King James Bible Defended* by Edward Hills.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM ends with:

1. *Multiple* "final" authorities.*

2. Multiple authorities that conflict.*

3. "Authorities" that attack *every fundamental of the faith* in one or more verses, and in one case (the *NASV* recommended by Bob Jones University)* recommends TWO separate GODS (Arianism), as taught by all Jehovah's Witnesses. In the *NASV,* one of these "Gods" is begotten, and the other is unbegotten. One of these "Gods" is called simply "GOD," and the other is called a "*UNIQUE* GOD."[13]

4. No final authority beyond some man's opinion who gave his preferences after considering some other men's opinions.

5. Each scholar his own "god" (Gen. 3), **"knowing good and evil,"** and sitting in judgment on *anything* God said that the scholar doesn't like or cannot

understand. (I gave the classic illustration of this many years ago and recorded it in *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship,* pg. 225).

6. THE RESTORATION OF THE ALEXANDRIAN TEXT OF THE ALEXANDRIAN CULT: THE ONE THAT USHERED IN THE DARK AGES.*

Your pastor is "shaping up" fine, isn't he? Now he can become a "GOD." (No overstatement; look at the firsthand, personal, eyewitness account of a dying man in *The Last Grenade,* p. 331.)

III. "SOURCE CRITICISM"

Didn't know such things existed, did you? Isn't it amazing to what a young man called to preach has access, about which his congregation will never find out? Let me tell you, honey, when they come out of the sausage factory these days, they are all from the same string of baloney. Their authority is "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM."

Source Criticism is built on the non-Christian, nonscriptural hypothesis that if two writers say the same thing they either had to copy a common writer who had already written it, or one of them is copying the other one. Hence, Matthew wrote first and Mark *partially* copied him. Or, Mark wrote first and Luke and Matthew made additions. Or, all three used an "unknown source" ("Q" document: "last night I saw upon the stair a little man who wasn't there, he wasn't there again today, etc."), or else two of them used it, and then one of them copied from the two, etc.

This problem "NATURALLY ARISES" when one throws out John as a Gospel and pretends the Gospels are just Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The "problem" is based on *one* article of infidelity and one only; i.e., the Author of Scripture (God) could not possibly have led two men to use identical wording, nor could He have led them to add details not given by another writer. In

short, "Source Criticism" is based on the belief that the writing of the New Testament was absolutely *natural* and therefore can be perfectly explained in *naturalistic* terms.

The junkies (excuse me! "good, godly, reverent Biblicists who devoted their lives to trying to communicate what "the author" had in mind!) were *Papias* and *Eusebius,* who taught that Matthew wrote in Hebrew instead of Greek and Mark was the "interpreter" of Peter (see Irenaeus for this bushwhacking job, pg. 8). "Following Papias, there is a widespread and fairly unanimous tradition regarding the ORIGINS and chronological order of the Synoptic Gospels."[14]

Then suddenly the teacher will fail to make ONE remark on any tradition between Papias (Second Century) and Griesbach (1745–1812) on the ORIGINS. All of the rest of the class periods are arguments about chronological order. It is Griesbach, fifteen hundred years later, who begins to insist that if there was chronological order, then the *last* one had to "USE" those before it, and the *second* one "USED" the first one, and so forth. This opened Pandora's box—note Pandora's box is never opened until after 1611 (see *The History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. I., pp. 413–416)—and up pops Sanday, B. H. Streeter, Hawkins, W. C. Allen, W. R. Farmer, B.C. Butler, C. M. Tuckett, C. F. Burney, F. G. Dowling, and the *Griesbach Hypothesis* vs. the *Oxford Hypothesis,* etc., accompanied by five thousand idiots who think they are studying "the Bible."

Was Matthew used by Luke and Mark? Did Luke use Mark? Was Mark first so Matthew and Luke could use him? What about that unknown, unread, unfounded, unavailable, nonexistent "Q-Document" (see Darwin's missing links, Bob Jones' "original autographs," etc.)?

And what are the Scriptural proofs for this garbled mass of incoherent nonsense? Well, Matthew 3:7–10 has a wording that differs from Luke 3:7–9, though he repeated it " in almost *identical* language."[15]

Ain't that a "Jim Dandy" of a problem? And they gave you Papias to prove something or other. It was Papias who *denied that the Apostle John wrote the Book of Revelation (The History of the New Testament Church,* op cit. p. 95). Matthew 13:31–32 with Luke 13:18–19 and Mark 4:30–32 proves that Mark went through Luke and Matthew changing every place on which they agreed. Mark 7:31 with Matthew 15:29 proves that Matthew read Mark and *clarified* him. Matthew corrected Mark in Matthew 26:6 because Mark blew it in Mark 14:3 with "two genitive absolutes." Mark was already written when Luke and Matthew "corrected" him on Mark 4:31 (see Luke 13:19 and Matt. 13:31). But Matthew has to be more "primitive" than Luke because Matthew 7:9–11 says **"good things"** and Luke 11:13 says **"HOLY SPIRIT."**

Can you guess what the end of such "mischievous madness" is?

1. The first writer is often in *error* because he is "primitive."

2. The second and third writers *correct* his mistakes.

3. No writer can get anything from GOD, for he is working on another man's manuscript which contains "errors" that he has set about correcting. (If one did not know better, one would think that the "Smurfs" who invented this nonsense did nothing but attribute to Matthew, Mark, and Luke THEIR OWN *sins. *)*

In "SOURCE CRITICISM," Luke is a reviser or "redactor" of Mark in Mark 8:27; 8:19; 8:30–31; 8:34–9:1 and Mark 8:33. The truth is that no hypothesis on Source Criticism can be proved to be true or false, and

the only utility in studying it is to convince some fool that God could not have led Matthew, Mark, Luke (and John, for that matter) along separate paths at times or on identical paths at times. In view of the records found in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles—more than one thousand years before Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were born—one is amazed to think such a "course" could appear in a Christian school that professed to be engaged in training ministers.

But you want that degree, don't you, kid? Well, this is how to earn it! The name of the game is "YOU ARE GOD," and the Bible is subject to YOU.

IV. "FORM CRITICISM"

"Form" simply means that you ascribe "names" (*which you invent*) to certain passages of writing and then, in the future, classify all similar kinds of writings (style) to that "form." It is kind of like the Disney-world charts you see on evolution, published in every College textbook in America, if that textbook deals with Anthropology, Geology, Paleontology, or Archaeology. You call little sections of writings "pericopes" and then give them titles like "saying," "proverb," "anecdote," "legend," "parable," "pronouncement STORY," "tale," "miracle STORY," etc.

You see, at once, the unlimited possibilities for the Bible-denying sinner in getting rid of any passage he doesn't like! "Form criticism represents an endeavor to determine the ORAL prehistory of WRITTEN documents or sources and to classify the material according to the various 'forms,' or categories, or narrative, discourse, and so forth."[16] If you want to get rid of Hell, call Luke 16 a "parable." If you want to get rid of the Deity of Christ (Phil. 2:5–11), call it a "hymn. " If you want to dump the Incarnation (1 Tim. 3:16) call it a "legend," and so forth. Any truth can be gotten rid of—take the crossing of the Red Sea for example, or

Joshua's "long day"—by calling it a "STORY." Your pastor is really getting an "education," isn't he?

The basic axioms of FORM CRITICISM are:

1. The Gospels are NOT the work of one author (Matthew, Mark, or Luke, for example), but are just "popular literature" or "folk literature." These stories were revised, altered, and reshaped orally to "meet the needs of the community." (That is, they were invented lies manufactured for purposes of self-preservation.)

2. Ninety percent of their material (Matthew–Luke) was circulated orally twenty years before anyone wrote anything.

3. Different stories in the "tradition" were used and only the most useful (pragmatism) were retained. (Note the similarity between this and your "pastor's" USE of a translation he does not believe.*)

4. As the stories were *used,* they took on a form because they could be *used.*

5. To successfully get rid of God as the author of a "pericope," you use *dissimilarity*, *multiple attestation*, and *coherence*. That way you can ascribe any evangelist's information to ANYTHING, other than the Holy Spirit.

Form Criticism does not emerge till AFTER the *King James Bible* (see p. 14) with an unsaved German rationalist named *Johann G. Herder* (1796). Then comes Franz Overbeck (1899), Hermann Jordan (1911), Hermann Gunkel, Dibelius, Vincent Taylor, Bulanann, Klaus Berger, Talbert, Tiede, Theissen, Fiztmyer, and four thousand more backslidden, dead, cold, powerless, professing Christians who don't have enough spiritual power to preach in a rescue mission. There isn't one Bible-believing, soulwinning, evangelistic, missionary-minded "scholar" in the entire lot; nor did they ever produce ONE pastor, missionary, or evangelist with any more spirituality than themselves. For

every Billy Sunday, Dwight Moody, J. Frank Norris, W. B. Riley, Bob Jones Sr., Mordecai Ham, and Jack Hyles produced between 1880 and 1980, the Seminaries and Universities turned out one thousand of these ineffectual, stupid, bungling, spiritual "dead heads" without the power of a lightning bug.

Examples: Luke 5:1–11 is a "legend" (Dibelius). Bultmann says it is a "nature miracle" (i.e., God had nothing to do with it). The "original TRADITION" on Luke 5:1 –11 was the saying of verse 10, which has been "expanded into its symbolic ACTUALIZATION." (i.e., *the whole thing is a lie from start to finish*). Theissen says it was not a "nature miracle" but a "gift miracle." (Anything but God—anything.) Tiede says the passage is an "Epiphany call," but Berger calls it a "mandatio"—a mandate account. *Smokey Bear* says "Don't start fires," and *Road Runner* says "BEEP-BEEP! " To invent another whole trade, with more tradesman's terminology to charge you for, we find "Parenthesis," "exhortation" "dominical sayings," "liturgical prayer," "subgenres and apophthegems," "diatribes," "behavior forms," and "decision texts"; all of which mean nothing except some confused fool, without a brain in his head, is trying to dissect the Gospel accounts into brackets and then *label* them so they can't mean anything other than what he guesses they MIGHT mean.

But by now, your new pastor is ready for the shaft.

V. *"THE STUDY OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK IN THE LIGHT OF ANCIENT AND MODERN LINGUISTICS"*

You begin this discipline with a discussion of two of the most pagan and godless men who ever lived (Plato and Aristotle: see *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy,* chapters 2, 3, and 4, 1987),

Alexandrian scholarship, and good old Dionysius Thrax, whose "grammar" is the standard for 1,800 years, beginning in 100 B.C. Naturally, AFTER the *King James Bible* shows up, Thrax is superseded (Sir William Jones, 1749–1794). The prospective pragmatic humanist (your pastor) is taken through Marcus Varro (116–27 B.C.), Quintillian (A.D. 35–97), Priscian, Aelius Donatus, and Alexander de Villa Dei. After a grounding in the basics of Greek from J. Gresham Machen (or anyone like him), the aspiring "minister" is given the following format, which, incidentally, finishes him off as a New Testament Christian and washes him up as a Biblical preacher or evangelist.

1. The verbally inspired, original, New Testament autographs were written in Greek, *not English.**

2. Since no translation is *perfect,* only "the original Greek text" is perfect.*

3. Therefore, a man who knows Greek ALWAYS knows more about *truth* in its PERFECTION than a man who wastes time with any English translation,* especially the *King James* since it came from *inferior* Greek manuscripts that are not as close to "the originals" as the Dark-Age Roman Catholic Jesuit Rheims Bible was!

4. "THE GREEK TEXT" is always more accurate than the *King* James, although the term "THE GREEK TEXT" is a lie. There is no such thing as "THE" Greek text. The professor is simply putting the definite article on the particular Greek Testament that he is using to alter the *King James'* text. It could be Nestle, Aland, or Metzger; or it could be Beza, Erasmus, or Stephanus; or it could be Lachmann, Tischendorf, or Griesbach. "THE GREEK TEXT" is used to *imply* that the professor has the original. (All apostate liars use this expression constantly; it is a major identification mark of the Cult.)*

5. The student is now given Greek grammar and syntax to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the *AV* is not just a *bad* translation, but a *misleading* one, and that the young pastor would do well to spend the rest of his life studying a DEAD LANGUAGE that went out of popular usage more than seventeen hundred years ago. Along with this, he is told that since Deissmann proved that the New Testament Greek was the popular street language of its day and time, that the *AV* is archaic because it is NOT the street language of 1990. You must give up your English Bible and trust a Greek teacher.

This is worded as follows: The "ORIGINAL GREEK throws a searchlight on passage after passage and reveals to most readers hitherto UNKNOWN DEPTHS of beauty and TRUTH."[17] (That is, what you are about to see has been "hidden in darkness" by the *AV*, but now you are going to get " advanced revelations" not found in the *AUTHORIZED VERSION.*) The Alexandrian Guru continues: "A person cannot be a theologian unless he is first a GRAMMARIAN . . . He who knows Greek has a tool to help him toward ACCURATE exposition of Scripture and is generally LESS LIKELY to err in interpretation than he would otherwise be."[18] Get the drift? The Holy Spirit is not the interpreter; so Robertson, Deissmann, Moulton, Trench, Vincent, Thayer, Alford, Warfield, and Machen all missed the Restoration of Israel, the Rapture, the Judgment Seat of Christ, Paul's ministry contrasted to Christ's, and the truth on Daniel's Seventieth Week. Five of them believed in sprinkling babies to regenerate them. That is the *"SEARCHLIGHT"* they got from being Greek grammarians.

But the Alexandrian Cult goes much further than this with their delusions of grandeur and literary hallucinations; they wind up telling the young preacher that

it is *impossible* for him to properly exegete the Bible without the use of a Greek lexicon. Note: "It is ESSENTIAL that the student master the conjugation of the verb before he attempts to exegete, for without such a background exegesis is IMPOSSIBLE."[19] Do you know who said that? Dr. Boyce Blackwelder of the *NKJV* committee (on which Curtis Hutson served). Dr. Blackwelder teaches that any Christian can go to Hell after being *regenerated and placed in the Body of Christ.* "Saving faith involves *both* the initial act of believing and the *continuous* attitude of trusting Him . . . every person who believes in Christ has eternal life . . . has it while, *and as long as,* he is trusting. Thus we see the importance of Jesus' statement **'he that endureth to the end shall be saved.'**"[20] Blackwelder's understanding of the "conjugation of the Greek verb" gave him so much light on the "hidden depths of the original Greek" that he took a Tribulation passage aimed at Israel and applied it DOCTRINALLY to the New Testament Body of Jesus Christ.

A more stupid, bungling, religious clown has never fallen out of the back end of a circus wagon.

These are the kind of men who have trained FIVE generations of "ministers" since 1880. The miracle is that every church in America today is not already a burlesque house "pastored" by lesbians and faggots, with a jazz band in the choir loft and belly dancers taking up the collection.

How is it done at Moody Bible (!!) Institute? "The Greek words are verbally inspired (after quoting NESTLE'S TEXT!), and inspiration extends to the GRAMMAR of the text . . . the student who uses his Greek Testament has access to MORE CLEARLY PRESENTED truth than the student of the English Bible, and is therefore less liable to arrive at ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATIONS."[21] Wanna bet? "The one who

uses his Greek text is always *the more accurate and able* expositor of the word." Well, not one time since A.D. 1600, no. Frank Norris, Erich Sauer, and Clarence Larkin could exposit more "truth" from the New Testament in one sermon, or one book, than you could find in all the books that Wuest, Machen, Warfield, and Trench ever wrote. "Such practical distinctions are lost to the student of the English Bible but readily available to the student of THE Greek New Testament."[22]

Note that every time, one hundred percent of the time, without one exception, the lying apostate will stick the definite article "THE" before "GREEK TEXT" to imply that *he has* the original Greek New Testament. This lie is carefully planned and calculated to mislead the student, for there has never existed on this earth "THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT," not even when the New Testament was completed in the "originals." All Alexandrians use this "gimmick." It is standard at every major Christian College, University, and Seminary in America. At Bob Jones University it is used more than ten times a DAY. In a moment I will show you why this lie is used.

This is the expression that Curtis Hutson used, in 1991, in a letter to Dr. Herbert Noe, and then had to backtrack and crawfish his way out by distributing a tract on "UNNECESSARY DIVISIONS AMONG FUNDAMENTALISTS," in which he backslid long enough to say that the *AV* was "A" Bible, albeit not "THE Bible." "*The* Bible," in Hutson's letter to Dr. Noe, was stated as "*THE* Greek text." This correspondence was printed in the *Bible Believers' Bulletin* in July of 1989. Here, Hutson said that "Ruckman" corrected "*THE* Bible" because he corrected "THE Greek text."

A little later, he realized what a terrible error he

had made, so he put out a small booklet to prove that he really didn't mean that. He actually believed the *King James Bible* was the "WORD OF GOD" all along; he was just kidding about *"THE Greek* text." Thus, Curtis wound up with an uninspired "Bible" which was the "word of God" (*AV*, 1611) and the inspired "Bible" (*"THE* Greek text") which was also the "word of God," *although he never preached it.* If Curtis Hutson had been wiser (i.e., more crooked), he would have done what John R. Rice did when advertising a work by the Reverend E. S. Anderson (*Sword of the Lord*, Sept. 1977): "Have you got THE WORD? (see Gen. 3:1) The *ORIGINAL GREEK* WORD. The Bible course by Rev. E. S. Anderson. NOW you can learn and understand the TRUE word by studying *THE ORIGINAL GREEK* TEXT."

In 1977, the *Sword of the Lord* claimed it had access to the *ORIGINAL* GREEK TEXT penned by the apostles. There it is. Once they started saying *"original* Greek" they graduated to "THE ORIGINAL," AND THEN TO "THE Greek text," and now, finally "THE *ORIGINAL* GREEK TEXT." You never met a bigger pack of liars on the face of this earth, bar NONE.

Now, do you know how this lying winds up? Well, here it is, direct from the head of the Bible Department at Bob Jones University—the treacherous sophist who tried to prove there was a complete Greek Old Testament circulating before A.D. 90 (see p. 56). Here is Stewart Custer, heading up the apostasy for every Alexandrian in the Cult, and coming right out in plain print and telling you that he has the plenary, verbally inspired, infallible Scriptures and you don't. Here are the statements, which can be obtained in xerox form, from their originals, at the Bible Baptist Bookstore in Pensacola, Florida.

1978: "I defend *every word* in the ORIGINAL AUTOGRAPHS."

"The Bible is indeed the Word of God, insofar as it agrees with the wording of *the original Greek.*"

"The original Greek and Hebrew *manuscripts* are the INERRANT WORD OF GOD . . . the *King James Version is* a good English translation; I have USED it all my life and highly recommend it."

1981: "As far as having an INSPIRED and INFALLIBLE Bible, yes, I have one. The (!!) Greek Testament THAT I HOLD IN MY HANDS. I will defend EVERY *WORD* of it."

"So as far as having a VERBALLY *INSPIRED* BIBLE, I HAVE ONE, and I READ IT EVERY DAY."

That is the teaching that is being taught by the head of the Bible Department at Bob Jones University. After telling you that he had *the original, verbally inspired Greek words of the original autographs,* he would not tell you WHERE to obtain a copy or WHAT the copy was called. That beats a Roman Catholic Dark Age Index (a list of forbidden books) "all holler" (NC, circa 1800).

If the Greek New Testament to which Custer referred was Nestle's text, he could not have possibly defended at least 420 words in it, for Nestle himself altered more words than that in ONE EDITION, after retaining them for eighty-three years. If THE Greek New Testament to which Custer referred was Aland and Metzger (United Bible Societies), he was telling you that the Dark Age Jesuit text of the *Douay Rheims Version* (1582) was to be used to correct the Protestant Reformation Greek text in more than fifty places. Playing his cards close to his vest, the old, dead orthodox, lying compromiser simply refused to tell you the *name* of "THE" Greek text he held "in his hands."

The implication is clear. If these Alexandrians

HAD the "plenary verbally inspired originals," they would DENY YOU ACCESS TO THEM AND MAKE YOU COME TO THEM ($$$) TO OBTAIN "THE TRUTH."

This is the Cult that trained five generations of "ministers" since 1880. And this time, I didn't fall back on a Neo-Evangelical, a "Liberal," or a "Modernist." I *gave you the classroom teaching that goes on in 1992 at Bob Jones University, which claims to be a "Fortress of Faith" and a "Bastion of ORTHODOXY." These* are the hypocrites who complain about "King James Onlyism" and "Ruckman's weird and peculiar teachings." The teaching of the head of their Bible (!!) Department (given above) has the most "PECULIAR," WEIRD, WACKO, UNORTHODOX, EXTREMIST, FANATICAL, HETERODOX HERESY I have ever seen in print in my life, which includes all of the publications of the Watchtower Society, the British Israelites, the *Book of Mormon,* the *Koran,* the Moonies, Mary Ellen White, Mary Baker Eddy, Madam Blavatsky, C. W. Leadbeater, Josef Goebbels, the Papal Encyclicals, plus the Council of Trent.

The man that wrote that heterodox confession is a major promoter of the "WORLD CONGRESS OF FUNDAMENTALISM," sponsored by BJU.

Can you imagine what a graduate of BJU is going to do to a local church if he takes such "Bible teaching" seriously? Can you imagine what he going to do on the mission field by rejecting the universal language (English) of this century and replacing it with a dead language that went out of use more than thirteen hundred years before Martin Luther?

This is the fruit (**"by their fruits ye shall know them"**) of calling "King James Onlyism" a heresy and substituting, in its place, "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM." It creates a Satanic system of lies built on a lie

and supported and promoted by pro*fessional liars* ($$$). The miracle is (in view of five generations of "ministers" having been trained by this Cult) that God has not nuclear-bombed America off the map twenty years ago.

Now the dastardly deed has reached its climax. The young man called to preach—if he ever was called to preach—has had his authority removed entirely from him.* If he had *Literary Criticism* and *Sociological Criticism* in his courses, along with *Redaction Criticism* and *Canonical Criticism,* he is now at the point where:

1. The Gospels were naturally manufactured folk tales, containing fairy stories. All of them need *correction* and redaction.

2. God is not the author of any line in the New Testament. The "author" is one or more authorities who may not have signed their right name to the work. (This is called "Pseudonymity in the New Testament.")

3. A dead language, which God discarded more than five hundred years before the Crusades, is to be the judge of the universal language of the Twentieth Century, English.*

4. There are no "Scriptures" on this earth, for **"all scripture is given by inspiration of God."** So the best he can do is promote a Roman Catholic English Bible.*

5. Out on the field, he is still held in subjection to the school he attended and the professors who taught him.* *They* are his "final authority in all matters of faith and practice." But if he is smart (like Robert Sumner, Doug Kutilek, Bob Jones III, John Ankerberg, Chuck Swindoll, and Stewart Custer), he will keep his mouth shut about where he got his information that caused him to reject the *AV*, and pretend that God gave him his "insights" into the truth. Thus, his congregation will accept HIM as *the final authority* instead of

the Book.* If anyone confronts him with the BOOK, he can claim that person is a demonized "heretic" belonging to a Cult called "Ruckmanites."*

That is what Bible believers in America have been up against since 1960.

In 1991, we offered ten opportunities for any Christian leader to testify as to where and when it was that he first lost his faith in the *AV,* after believing it. Not one Christian leader in America (Lee Roberson, Jerry Falwell, John MacArthur, Chuck Swindoll, Bob Jones Jr., Bob Jones III, Arlin Horton, James Price, Arthur Farstad, F. F. Bruce, Zane Hodges, Kenneth Wuest, Bruce Metzger, et al.) opened his mouth. *And they are not going to.*

When your "pastor" finally emerges from his Christian hellhole, he emerges as a confused, distracted, ignorant, young egotist who has been filled (literally stuffed) with the idea that no preacher is a good Bible teacher or preacher unless he has access to the Targums (to understand that Eph. 4:8–10 doesn't mean what it says literally), the Nag Hammadi (so you can understand the early traditions of Christ's teachings), a complete knowledge of the Greco-Roman world (so he can understand 1 Cor. 9 and 2 Cor. 11), Greek verbs in their tenses (so he can understand 1 John), an understanding of the Greek "article" (so he can pervert 1 Tim. 6 and John 4), the Apocrypha and the Pseudopigrapha, the Tel Amama Tablets, the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hermetica, and Josephus and Philo.

He also comes out with two of the most treacherous and false notions with which any brainwashed fool ever left an indoctrination course:

1. That you can ignore the PRACTICE and the SPEECH of Paul in your ministry and still be a real "New Testament" Christian leader.

2. That accuracy in correct Scripture interpreta-

tion lies in the study of a DEAD LANGUAGE and applying that dead language to a Book that has had the breath of God on it for more than 380 years.*

Paul is never caught dead saying "this word really means thus," or "a better translation should be," or "as this version puts it," or "unfortunately the word rendered here is such and such." No New Testament Christian TALKS like any man we have named in the last fifteen pages, where that man was teaching *Form Criticism, Structural Criticism, Canonical Criticism, Higher or Lower Criticism, Greek Grammar, New Testament Greek,* or *Interpretation* of EITHER TESTAMENT. Paul is a street preacher who winds up in jail. He preaches righteousness, temperance, judgment, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 20). He is as much like the Swindoll-Hutson-Jones-Farstad-Horton-MacArthur crowd as Sam Jones was like the Girl Scouts of America.

Let us now select another scholar out of this list of bungling apostates and watch how he applies all of his intensive Seminary training to the actual Scriptures when he tries to explain them. This will be Dr. Kyle Snodgrass, Dean of the Faculty, the Paul W. Brandel Professor of New Testament Studies at North Park Theological Seminary in Chicago. He holds the B.A., M.Div., and Ph.D. degrees, having studied at Tubingen and Princeton. Ready? (Here Snodgrass is discussing the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers.)

First, Snodgrass says that it is easy to understand the use of an Old Testament text as an illustration (1 Cor. 10:11), but it is "not so easy to understand how a text that was not intended as MESSIANIC (Deut. 18:15) becomes understood as Messianic" (Acts 3:22–23).[23]

Isn't that amazing? John takes **"that prophet"** in John 1:21 directly from Deuteronomy 18:15. Why did

Snodgrass think that the passage was not a reference to the Messiah when it was *the Father of the Messiah* who spoke the verse? What happened to the doctor's MIND while searching "the original Greek text"?

Snodgrass cannot see how you can apply Hosea 11:1 to Christ (Matt. 2:15), after being told that ISRAEL was God's *firstborn son* (Exod. 4:22) just like *Jesus Christ* was (Psa. 89:27). And then, the good doctor expresses amazement over Isaiah 6:9–10 being fulfilled in John 12:39–41. "Such examples of unexpected uses of the Old Testament could be multiplied easily." So Snodgrass offers us a "key" which he says came from the helpful insights given to us by the *Qumran Scrolls.* He lists the key as "understanding four presuppositions." They are as follows: 1) Corporate solidarity. 2) Correspondence in history. 3) Eschatological fulfillment. 4) Christological approach.

I have never read the Qumran scrolls, but I have been through the Holy Bible 127 times, and I must confess, that in 127 readings I have never found ONE of Snodgrass' "presuppositions" to be worth fifteen cents in understanding *one verse in either Testament.*

Snodgrass thinks that "corporate solidarity" exists in the "Shemitic mind." Snodgrass says it should not be viewed as a "strange thing" because Paul uses it in 2 Corinthians 5:14.

But what Caucasian fool doesn't know that *Uncle Sam* is a corporate entity? Or that *"The Bank of America" is* a multiple corporation, or that the expression "The pecan tree is indigenous to the Southland" is a reference to 800,000 pecan trees. Where does the "Shemitic mind" get into this business? "The Pope" is any Pope who ever lived, and "the *Roman Catholic Church" is* no more ONE church than "the *Baptist Church.*" What is *"the Body of Christ"* in the epistles to the *Gentiles* (not Shemites), written by the Apostle

to the Gentiles (not Shemites)? Where was there any problem except the one erected by the tradesmen so they could CHARGE you for getting them to "solve it"? Who is trying to confuse you?

"The PRESUPPOSITION is that the way God worked in the past is mirrored in the way He works in the present and future."[24] Presupposition? Why you nut! That is a doctrinal statement found in Ecclesiastes 1:9–10 and illustrated, over and over again, in secular and sacred history, without any New Testament writer quoting anything. Snodgrass says a text is not used up by a single event. (You bet your booties it isn't!) But when Snodgrass states this truth, he cannot *apply* it. Going to Isaiah 40:1–8 for John the Baptist, Snodgrass fails to see that the Second Advent is right in front of his snoot, side by side with John the Baptist (Isa. 40:1–2)—as it appears again in Isaiah 9:2 right alongside Matthew 4:16, and again, in Isaiah 61:1–2 alongside Luke 4:18–19. Snodgrass says the dual fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3 is not the Second Advent but "those words from Isaiah can even be applied to others who "prepare the way.'"[25] Nonsense.

Snodgrass unwittingly limits all Old Testament prophecies to "our present situation"[26] (while talking about a text not being used up by a "single event"). There are five hundred verses in the Old Testament that have not been "used up" by *any* event that took place *anywhere* when Jesus Christ showed up. (Spurgeon has this trouble to the point of fanaticism: see *The Bible Believer's Commentary on Psalms,* 1992.)

Snodgrass's "END TIME" is in the past for Christians. He is a PostMillennialist. Snodgrass thinks that Isaiah 6:9–10 *is* quoted so much in the New Testament because it is the "classic expression of hardness of heart." He missed the Tribulation in the passage and the witness to the Deity of Christ (see John 12:37–41),

which was altered in the *ASV, NASV, NIV, RSV, NRSV,* etc.

Dr. Snodgrass closes his meandering with a "marvelously rich theological text" that "does justice to the Old Testament background."[27] This turns out to be John 1:18, where a *UNIQUE* GOD saw God. The "UNIQUE GOD" was in the bosom of the other God—God the Father. Thus forty years of preaching, teaching, and studying at Tubingen and Princeton produced a Jehovah's Witness who accepted Arianism (A.D. 325) as orthodoxy. This same heresy is the official teaching of Bob Jones University in their most highly recommended translation—the *NASV.* It says that a "Begotten God" declared *a God* who was *not* begotten (John 1:18).

If YOUR son is called to preach, and goes off to a Seminary to study and immerse himself in "godly Christian scholarship," do you think he will fare as well (or better) than Dr. Snodgrass?

What makes you think so? Would you bet on the life and ministry of your son, if God called him to preach? The material your son (or brother or husband, whatever) is going to be taught is the material listed in *The Christians Handbook of Biblical Scholarship,* chapter 2. That is ALL the material that any member of the Alexandrian Cult knows beyond what any layman could pick up at any bookstore (if it was written by Pember, C. Larkin, E. Bullinger, E. Hills, S. Collett, P. S. Ruckman, E. Sauer, S. Gipp, H. Evans, and A. W. Pink). The writings of those authors would have more BIBLICAL material in them than the whole raft put out by Bruce, Metzger, Fenton, Streeter, Green, Hort, Schaff, Lightfoot, Hodges, Machen, Warfield, Robertson, Kittel, Wuest, Milligan, Deissmann, Wilson, McGregor, Archer, Rendal, Kubo, Swete, Alford, Hackett, Zahn, Burkitt, and Sanday. I say "any bookstore," but that

should be qualified by saying, "any bookstore NOT on a College or University campus."

Many Christian Colleges have an "INDEX of forbidden books" their students are not to buy or obtain or even READ.* These books are not pornography, nor were they written by "Neo Evangelicals" or "Modernists" or "Liberals." They were written by born-again, Bible-believing Christians.

Now that the sucker is thoroughly immersed in declensions, gender, number, iota subscriptums, epsilon-contract verbs, genitive absolutes, attributive participles, and "anacaluthon," he is ready to study "THE" Greek New Testament, which doesn't exist and never did. There never was ONE copy of any Greek Testament on this earth that contained the "original autographs" of James, Paul, and John in one volume; "THE Greek New Testament" has as much substance as floss candy. He is given either a Syrian-Antiochan Greek Testament (eclectic, coming from Erasmus, Beza, Stephanus and Elzevir) or an Egyptian-Alexandian text (Nestle, Aland, Metzger, Hort, et al.) from Rome. He now "searches the Scripture"—without believing that anything he is reading is **"given by inspiration of God,"** although that is the definition of **"scripture"** in the "Scripture."*

He is now prepared to give you the "TRUE meaning" of the verse and convey to you the "original intent of the author." To do this, he will have to correct your *King James Bible* approximately fifty thousand times.

Any young person sitting in a pew in front of such a bumfoozled baboon will grow up as a Bible-rejecting ignoramus. The pastor sees this immediately, so he USES a version acceptable to his congregation (reserving the right to correct it anytime it says something he doesn't believe or can't understand).* Away goes the whole hellish, godless, hypocritical sideshow with the

BAN of God Almighty on it from start to finish. After five generations of this (1880–1900, 1900–1920, 1920–1940, 1940–1960, 1960–1980), you have the "contemporary scene" in modern "American Christianity."

The reason why you can't get *one* main-line Fundamentalist leader in America today to give *one* word of testimony on WHO taught him there were errors in the *Authorized Version* (or WHERE he learned them or WHEN he first learned them), is because everyone of them was taught that some man's opinion was superior to the Holy Bible (*AV*) and, therefore, a MAN should be followed (humanism) instead of the Book. They were taught this in a school. Not *one* of them got his information from the Author of Scripture: *the Holy Ghost.*

Now, there is no need to rest our case with Dr. Snodgrass who may or may not have been a dead orthodox Evangelical or an apostate Neo-evangelical or an interdenominational "Conservative." No, all you have to do is go to a Fundamentalist Baptist College (now a "University") where all of the faculty are saved, "Bible-believing," Fundamental Baptists, and what do you run into? Exactly what you would run into at Harvard or Yale where an unsaved Liberal is teaching a Communist to occupy a "Trinitarian" pulpit. This is Bruce Lackey, the BEST (and I mean the BEST) Bible teacher Tennessee Temple Schools have ever had.

1. *Deuteronomy 23:18* is incorrect; **"dog"** should be "whore."

2. *Joshua 6:17* is incorrect; **"accursed"** should be "dedicated."

3. *Isaiah 1:13* "presents a problem in translation" because it is "awkward to us and not readily understood." (Boy, am I ever confused! I understood it the first time I read it back in 1949, and 124 times since

then, and never found any problem in it. Boy, am I ever shallow!)

4. *Mark 1:8* is incorrect; it should be "baptized IN" rather than **"with."** (This is an old boo-boo, confusing the Locative case with the Instrumental case).

5. Acts 12:4 is incorrect. (See detailed correction of Lackey's error on pp. 78–80.)

6. Acts *19:37* should read with all Roman Catholic Bibles recommended by the National Council of Churches—the greatest organized body of Communists and International Socialists in the United States.

7. *Romans 1:16* is incorrect because it wasn't "consistently translated" (not one translation on the market—*ASV, RV, NASV, RSV, NRSV, NKJV, NIV—is* "consistently translated").

8. First *Corinthians 4:4* is incorrect: **"by"** should be "against."

9. *Romans 3:4* is incorrect. It should read with the *RSV* and *NRSV* of the National Council of Communist Churches.

This is the fruit of "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM." It replaces the *Authorized* text of the *King James Bible* with the preferences and opinions of destructive critics. They become your "final authority." Lackey has been "long gone" from TTU, but the long-tenured apostates (Martin, Price, et al.) remain to multiply what you have just read. James Price—in conjunction with Harold Ockenga and Curtis Hutson—cooperated in the publication of a translation that made more than *ten thousand changes* like the nine above.

Attending a militant, evangelistic, separated, soul-winning, Fundamental, Baptist institution does not save you from becoming a powerless, backslidden, professional critic and LIAR. The Neo-evangelicals have no corner on falsehood where the *AV* shows up as an issue.

"Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (2 Tim. 3:5).

Not once in the operation is the sucker warned of the power of Greek grammar to prevent a scholar from finding Biblical truth.* Dr. A. T. Robertson and Dr. Robert Dick Wilson were two of the most stupid Bible "scholars" who ever perverted the words of the living God, and the material that God revealed to Larkin, Scofield, and even Stam was completely DENIED to them by the Author of Genesis–Revelation. Everything today that Zane Hodges, Metzger, F. F. Bruce, James Price, and the staffs of one hundred Christian Colleges, Seminaries, and Universities know about the Book, that is TRUE, was in print before 1930. Furthermore, no man or woman on earth would have had to have ONE year of Form Criticism, Textual Transmission, Manuscript Evidence, Systematic Theology, Structural Criticism, Sociological Criticism, Greek Grammar, Hebrew Idioms, research in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Biblical Archaeology, Canonical Criticism, Redaction Criticism, Literary Criticism, or Studies in the Graeco-Roman Culture to get ANY OF THE MATERIAL.

Ruckman's Law: "Iffen hit don't make no sense, they's a buck in it."

VI. "LITERARY CRITICISM"

You are to believe that you can get a better understanding of Scripture if you learn that Paul (in Phil. 4:8–10) uses "anaphora," "ellipsis," "polysyndeton," and "periodic sentences." Literary Criticism is the analysis of "writing styles." It is concerned with the "aesthetic effects of language."[28] You are to believe that this will enable you to understand a Bible verse better and grasp the "message being communicated," for you will get the "total message." Further, your future pastor (these baloney sausage factories have been turning them out in America at a rate of better than

five hundred a year, for forty years) can "help readers understand how to communicate with others" and help them "appreciate GOD." Dr. Aida Spencer tells us how to "visualize figures of speech" and uses Philippians 4 as an example. To "visualize it," she alters eight words in it and *adds* seven words to it. (For further comment, see the Holy Spirit's record of Gen. 3:2–5, where Eve does a little "visualizing" herself with Dr. Spencer). The nugget that this female gets out of Philippians 4 is that DOING and THINKING are both essential.

Can you believe it?

Pretending that she is a preacher outlining a sermon, Dr. Spencer says that the "ands" inserted in verse 9 show that the items listed are equally important. Thus, a four point outline: 1) Do what I taught you. 2) Do what I told you. 3) Do what you heard me preach to others. 4) Do what you saw me do. Who, that was called to preach, couldn't have picked that up without any knowledge of any "literary forms"? Paul is "conscious of his style of writing," says the Professor. You mean he wasn't writing down what God told him to write down the way He told him to write it down? Or do you mean that since God used Paul's natural way of writing and his talents that Paul had to be CONSCIOUS of his natural way of writing? This poor deluded woman, who never led a soul to Christ in her life, "After comparing the style of 2 Corinthians 11:16–12:13; Romans 8:9–39; and Philippines 3:2–4:13, I discovered that Paul varies the manner in which he communicates in order to reach different goals with his audience."[29]

So did Erich Marie Remarque (*All Quiet* on *the Western Front*), so did Thomas Mann (*Of Time and the River*), so did James Joyce (*Ulysses*), so did Victor Hugo (*Les Miserables*), and so did Moses, Peter, James, John, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Herman Woulk (*The*

Winds of War). I never heard any public speaker in my life (1921–1992) who didn't "vary his manner" to reach "different goals." Why would some idiot waste nine thousand dollars on a Seminary education to learn THAT?

Now watch how God Almighty bankrupts anyone's mind who messes with that Book. To prove that Paul "varies his style" to reach different "goals," you are given the following in the classroom. (It is taken for granted you don't know enough about the contents of any Bible to spot a professional liar.)

1. "The Corinthians are at war with Paul, so Paul becomes a warrior."[30] The WARFARE is in Ephesians 6, and the *main references* to a soldier fighting a fight are in the epistles to Timothy. First Corinthians 13 is as "unwarrior" sounding as a Christian FM station. Paul is a RUNNER BOXER in 1 Corinthians 9. First Corinthians 15 has no more to do with the military than 1 Corinthians 10 and 11. It is a discourse on FARMING and HARVESTS.

2. "The Philippians love and respect Paul, so Paul remains their 'father'."[31] There is no mention of Paul being a father to any Philippian. He is a FATHER to the Corinthians (see 1 Cor. 4:15). "Paul, in Philippians, was a father to Timothy" (read the passage). A loving "father, writing to children who love him" does not write like Philippians 3:1–8 (read it), 3:14–15 (read it), and 2:30 (read it).

3. "The Roman churches are unknown personally to Paul, so Paul becomes a 'DIPLOMAT'."[32] For example? Well, here is Paul's "diplomacy" in Romans!

"But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath . . . Let God be true, but every man a liar . . . whose damnation is just . . . their throat is an open

sepulchre . . . the wages of sin is death . . . the carnal mind is enmity against God . . . if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die . . . who art thou that repliest against God? . . . if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou shalt be cut off . . . be not highminded, but fear . . . Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? . . . he that doubteth is damned if he eat . . . NEVERTHELESS, I HAVE WRITTEN MORE BOLDLY UNTO YOU . . . ."

That's a "diplomat" in LITERARY CRITICISM?

"If Paul placed so much importance on the manner of communication, should not we as disciples do likewise?"[33]

Are you getting the message of "higher Christian education"? The dear lady didn't give you one *rational* proposition or one *honest* report from the time she started until she tried to convert Paul into a bookworm. She is Associate Professor of New Testament at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in Massachusetts. You can imagine the mental condition of her classroom after a few weeks of the above.

There is something about "higher Christian education" that destroys a Christian's ability to READ and to THINK. This poor deluded soul is telling her students that if they become aware of a writer's "style" they can decide if that writer is trying to lead them to a "good goal" or not. NO EXAMPLES ARE GIVEN. To whom does she go for the source of this tommyrot? You guessed it: PLATO and ARISTOTLE again (see pg. 19). You are then recommended David Aune's work on *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (a book on "genres"). There is not one line in the entire book that gives any light on one verse in the New Testament that wasn't turned on *before 1930.* You are then told to read Hans Dieter Betz, Charles Talbert, R. Alan Culpepper, Mary Ann Tolbert, George Kennedy,

G. B. Caird, James Muhlenburg, Michael Crosby, Phyllis Trible, and the others who compose the LITERARY CRITICAL section of the Alexandrian Cult.

Any Christian with an eighth-grade education, a *King James Bible,* and a concordance can get more truth and more "original intent of the author" than if he consulted the entire library recommended. Dr. Spencer gives you her "best," after all of this nonsense, and tells you that "understanding the RICHNESS of many New Testament passages can be increased by a knowledge of literary forms." Example? The parable of Luke 18:1–8 is not meant to teach *importunity in prayer;* it is just a general story about "God's righteousness."[34] How's that for "richness?" Or as the apostate blockheads say, "an embarrassment of riches."

To really "understand the New Testament," like Mary Ann Tolbert does (*Perspectives on the Parables*), one must use "both semiotics and rhetorical criticism."[35] She says the Parable of the Prodigal Son is a "parallel plot" in the sense that the parable is like a DREAM.[36] Does Mary Ann know what the parable means *doctrinally?* That is, does she know why the Lord Jesus Christ spoke it to the congregation with whom He was dealing? Does Mary Ann understand why the progression went from a lost coin to a lost sheep to a lost son? She hasn't got the "foggiest."

"All scripture . . . is profitable for doctrine."

"Psychological readings" are found that present "two sides of ambivalence," where someone is "painfully aware of his, or her, emotional ambivalence toward those with whom attachment is most intimate and important."[37] That is about as relevant to the Parable of the Prodigal Son as a women's lib demonstration on Lesbians having mixed emotions toward their mothers.

VII. "RELIABLE AND TRUSTWORTHY TRANS-

LATIONS"

You can imagine, by now, the mental condition of the young man who has been sitting under such gas bags as the last forty people we have mentioned. No soulwinning, no missionary burden, no reality about Heaven or Hell, no preparation for death or judgment, no preparation for the Second Coming or the Judgment Seat of Christ, and no exposure of Vatican politicians or Roman Catholic imperialism. No instructions on street preaching, jail ministries, or personal witnessing. Not *ONE* essential New Testament doctrine *anywhere* on the horizon, in any direction. He is being trained to doubt the Holy Bible and pass his infidelity on to other Christians: "thoroughly furnished unto every evil work."

Eventually, the "trainee" hits 2 Timothy 3:16. After being told this is NOT a reference to the Scriptures which Paul, Jesus, and the Ethiopian eunuch read (which it IS: see *The Christians Handbook of Biblical Scholarship,* chap. 10, 1989), he is then led to believe that God does not interfere with TRANSLATORS. He just intervenes long enough to get *one* "original autograph," and then He lets man "take over." (It is kind of like Postmillennialism, where Jesus Christ returns to Heaven to sit down on His throne and "reign" while YOU "work out the details"; i.e., The Hundred Years War, the Crusades, the Thirty Years War, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, World Wars I and II, Vietnam, the Inquisition, the Holocaust, Korea, the drug traffic, abortions, humanism, the Civil War, the Spanish American War, the French, American, and Russian Revolutions, and the War of 1812.)

After going into all kinds of explanations on "plenary inspiration" and "Theopneustia," and dumping on the sucker all of the material found in *The Inspiration of the Scriptures* (Boettner), *The Doctrine of Inspira-*

tion Explained and Vindicated (Basil Manly), *The Infallible Word* (Stonehouse and Wooley), *Faith and Inspiration* (Robert Watts), *Revelation and Inspiration* (James Orr), and *Our God-Breathed Book* (Rice), your "pastor" graduates quoting books that God did not BREATH to prove He breathed them, and memorizing uninspired "Scripture" that is *not* "Scripture" to prove the "Scriptures" are *Theopneustia.*

In order to reinforce the delusion that only "original autographs" were inspired, he is taught to alter 2 Peter 1 to read "holy men of God *wrote* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." This, again, is an absolute identification mark of the Alexandrian Cult. Everyone of them, *without one single exception,* alter 2 Peter 1:21 to meet the demands of denying the Scriptural definition of Scripture found in Acts 8:32, Luke 4:21; Acts 17:2, 11; and 2 Timothy 3:15–16. The defection to LYING, to prove the lie, is one hundred percent.*

What the student will not be shown, not even in twenty-two years of formal education at any four Universities or Seminaries in the world, is:

1. Ezra and Nehemiah are TRANSLATING in Nehemiah 8 according to every scholar on the North American continent. You are to believe that they did NOT speak by the Holy Ghost, although 2 Peter 1:21 says they did.*

2. An unsaved man (Balaam for one and Caiaphas, for two) can be *inspired by the Holy Spirit when he speaks* (see Num. 23, 24 and John 11:51). Balaam is not speaking HEBREW to Balak, and he's not speaking GREEK or ARAMAIC. He is speaking MOABITE, because you were told in Nehemiah 13:23–24 (which not one man listed on the last twenty pages could find) that "Moabite" is not Hebrew.*

3. What "Scripture" any Jew between 400 B.C. and A.D. 33 learned (if he was in the Dispersion), he

had to get by TRANSLATIONS or a TRANSLATOR, for when these Jews of the Dispersion show up in Acts 2, their **"own language"** (Acts 2:6) is not Hebrew and it isn't Greek. Are these Bible-rejecting critics (who believe only in "verbally inspired originals") telling us that the people to whom **"the oracles of God"** were given (Rom. 3:2) had nothing **"given by inspiration"** for four hundred years and then suddenly (A.D. 33–90) it "started again?" Where have I heard that before?

4. The source of various tongues is GOD (see Gen. 11). Man originated NOTHING, unless you are a Darwinian evolutionist. When King Ahasuerus sent out his proclamation to 127 provinces (Esther 1:1, 8:9), do you think he sent it out in Hebrew? It is recorded in Hebrew in Esther. Did the "inspired" writer of Esther mess up the message when he retranslated it (Esther 8:8-13)? If **"where the word of a king is, there is power"** (Eccl. 8:4), are you going to be gullible enough to think that the recorded proclamation of a *converted king,* in say ten languages, was mistranslated when the author wrote it down in Hebrew? Nebuchadnezzar did the same thing in Daniel 4. Do you mean to tell me that God the Holy Spirit went ahead and "lost something" in translating from Nebuchadnezzar's "original?"*

5. How did twenty-two years in Seminary blind the professor (any and all of them) to Acts 2, where every "holy man of God" (see 2 Pet. 1:21) is speaking under the direct *"Theopneustia"* of inspiration with more than twelve different languages so the congregation can understand them? Why did God take the trouble to insure that **"every nation under heaven"** (Acts 2:5) should hear the WORDS of God in their own tongue instead of HEBREW and GREEK?*

6. What is LATIN doing as part of the "verbal plenary inspired originals"? The inscription on the cross

is NOT just in Hebrew and Greek; it is also in *Latin.* With Persian and Latin words used throughout the New Testament, why is the bullshooter in the professor's chair engaged in making you think that "only Hebrew and Greek" manuscripts will do? Do you think the angel in Acts 10 spoke to an Italian centurion in Hebrew? Why, then, would it be reported in Greek?*

7. Finally, all of the faculties and staffs (take any one hundred Seminaries, Universities, and Colleges at random) conveniently forget to show you the only other time the word **"inspiration"** pops up in Scripture (hoping you will not know the Book that well!) and then refuse to give you the FIRST real case of God breathing on anything (Gen. 2:7).* Isn't that the most remarkable omission you ever saw? With Ezekiel 37 describing in detail how *"Theopneustia"* takes place, not ONE (I say, not ONE) major Hebrew or Greek scholar in the history of the Church could describe the operation. His unbelief killed him just as dead as Ezekiel's **"dry bones."** He was drier than them when he got through. In Job 32:8 is the reference which is not given in the textbooks. The reason is obvious. The orthodox "Conservatives" are terrorized by the thought that a man can *speak* material, under direct divine inspiration, that is *non-canonical.* Of course man can and does (see Balaam and Caiaphas above). Many times Bible-believing preachers have preached thoughts and words that came directly from the throne of God (Gal. 3:5; Job 32:8), but they were not SCRIPTURE. This is why 2 Peter 1:21 was worded so carefully by the *King James* translators; they had access to advanced light and truth in 1611 denied to the revisers of the *RV, RSV, NRSV, ASV, NASV, NIV,* and *NKJV,* three hundred years later.

Back to our class. Back to the sucker who thought he could "learn the Bible" at Bob Jones, Tennessee

Temple, Springfield, Arlington, or Fort Worth!

He now graduates with two classes of "Scripture": *inspired* Scripture (unread, unseen, uncollected, and non- existent) and *non-inspired* "Scripture" (one hundred English translations which, between them, deny more than forty salient truths of "Scripture"). The brainwashed idiot refers to one of those translations as "the Word of God" because it contains "God's message," and says boldly, "We do not have to apologize for *calling* this version THE SCRIPTURE." He knows that he has already perjured his soul and destroyed his integrity, for **"all scripture is given by inspiration"** and the Scripture to which he referred is UNINSPIRED.

This is the official position today (1992) of Bob Jones University, Pensacola Christian College, Liberty University, Baptist Bible College, Wheaton, Fuller, Moody, and the forty-plus institutions of "higher learning" published in *Problem Texts* (now entitled *The "Errors" in the King James Bible*) and the *Bible Believers' Bulletin.*

Here he comes, after "supplying the pulpit"! Here is your new "pastor"!

Here is the "finished product of the brewer's art!"

Here is the fully accredited and fully qualified "minister" who will help you "cope" with your wife or husband and "share" God's love with sharers who share their faith with others. This man will show you how to let your wife run the family so she doesn't divorce you! What does he REALLY believe? (After all, professions of faith are a dime a dozen, and worth less than half that.)

1. No one has a copy of the Scripture.*

2. The Word of God is not the words found in any Book; it is a message found in several hundred books.*

3. All books which you call "the Word of God"

are full of mistakes, but "godly men" will correct them for you.*

4. No Book on earth is the final authority for anything, but we will profess that a Book we never saw (and which never existed for that matter!) IS our final authority.*

5. MAN is the final authority (Gen. 3:1–6). Use what works (pragmatism). Use what you "prefer" (humanism). Come to ME for an authoritative opinion (egotism), and I will base my authoritative opinion upon the authoritative opinions of authorities who taught me to get rid of the HOLY BIBLE, and replace it with the preferences and opinions of "authorities."

That is what you have in the American pulpits in 1992.

That explains the condition America is in today (see *The Damnation of a Nation,* 1991).

That is the only explanation you need if you believe one-tenth of what the Book said about nations, priests, prophets, and ministers. You don't need ONE more explanation. Might is right, me first you next, anarchy, **"lovers of their own selves . . . proud . . . ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth"** (2 Tim. 3:2–7), law of the jungle, survival of the fittest, **"every way of a man is right in this own eyes"** (Prov. 21:2), **"every man did that which was right in his own eyes"** (Judg. 21:25).

If your church is a congregation of middle-class deadheads who get "excited" about a Bible study based on "word studies" and "sociological implications," you have what you deserve: a bunch of pagan humanists interested in nothing but THIS LIFE, carnal humanists who have no concern for lost souls that are going to Hell and have no higher aim in life than winning friends and "influencing people" to like those who like the

ones who like them.

With Biblical authority gone, there is only one thing to preach: "THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE" (Laodicea). The rights of wives to run their husbands, the rights of children to disobey their parents, the rights of Christians to think about themselves and "develop" themselves, the rights of minorities to destroy majority decisions and desires, the rights of preachers to gain popularity by "focusing" the Christian's attention on his own psychological personal life so that Christianity revolves around "personality adjustments" and "maturing under tension." Billy Sunday? Out. Charles G. Finney? Out. John the Baptist? Out. Elijah? Out! Dwight Moody? Out! J. Frank Norris? OUT!! Biblical revival is not in the cards. Spiritual "renewal" is not in the deck. God sacked them when they sacked His Book. "Revival in Our Time?" Not till you shut down one hundred "Christian" Colleges, Universities and Seminaries, and padlock them permanently.

But I forgot to tell you about two more courses in the curriculum that produced the Alexandrian set-up, as it is in America today. We must look at *"The New Testament as Sacred Literature"* and *"The Development of Doctrine in the New Testament."*

VIII. "THE NEW TESTAMENT AS SACRED LITERATURE"

The emergence of the New Testament as "sacred literature" is a process so undocumented and undefinable that it would be safe to say that any money wasted on the course could just as well have been flushed down the toilet. When Dr. Robert Sloan (Baylor, Basel, and Princeton) begins to discuss the matters, he says that "a rider on a white horse" in Revelation is our Conquering Lord who "will rescue His beleaguered people."

There are TWO white horse riders in Revelation.

Dr. Sloan (who wrote for *The Biblical Illustrator* and the *Evangelical Quarterly*) was unable to count on his fingers. The "WHITE HORSE" rider of Revelation 6:1–2 is the Man of Sin.

The pattern taught will be that 1 Thessalonians was written before James (or before the Gospels for that matter) and that all of the material in the Gospels came from ORAL TRADITIONS and that it was circumstances that led "to the production of what we now call Gospels."[38] God the Holy Spirit has no part in this process. He is not mentioned once. Using "the tradition of Christ" from Colossians 2:6, 8 (*there is no tradition of Christ in Colossians* 2), Dr. Sloan says the Gospel itself is "tradition" and cites Galatians 1:9, 12 as proof texts. There is no "tradition" of ANY kind mentioned ANYWHERE in ANY version or manuscript of Galatians 1. The word that Paul used was **"revelation."** He was careful to tell you it was direct revelation *completely disassociated* from any "tradition" held by any human being, dead or alive (see Gal. 1:11, 2:1–2, 6).

There is something about "higher Christian education" that destroys a man's ability to READ and to THINK.

To explain away Philip's revelation (Acts 8:32–33) of the proper meaning of Isaiah *53*, Sloan says that Philip just gave out with a standard (then present) Christological interpretation which "MUST" have been raging between Christians and Jews over Isaiah 53. "There was a question as to which side of the debate Philip would take."[39]

What debate?

Why, don't you know? The one between Goldilocks and the Three Gummy Bears! Sloan's imagination just "ran riot."

Following the correct order (that the Scriptural

truths were first spoken, then written, then accepted as "authoritative," and lastly as "canonical"), doesn't solve one problem about why twenty-seven books, and twenty-seven books *only,* got into the "Canon." No council put them there till they were there. Irenaeus (A.D. 180) refers to the Gospels as "SCRIPTURE." No council told him anything. "Rules of faith" and "creeds" begin to pop up in the Second Century, but none of these were authorized by any council. Sloan rightly says that Athanasius "no more created the canon than modern-day politicians create opinion; rather, he reflected the emerging consensus."[40] Athanasius, in A.D. 367, is only bearing witness to a *long process* that began in A.D. 50 (or earlier) at "much *lower levels* in the life and related experiences, not of the 'church,' but hundreds of communities of faith scattered all over the Mediterranean world."[41]

The "Roman Catholic Church" never defined the Canon, settled the Canon, fixed the Canon, or authorized the Canon. The only time they tried it (in defining the Old Testament) they cursed Jesus Christ—"anathema" at the Council of Trent—*and misdefined it.*

The thing you learn from the Bible about *The Emergence of the New Testament Documents as Sacred Literature* is that the Holy Spirit (who wrote the documents and preserved them) bore witness to them in the Body of Christ, inspite of the work of Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Papias, Ignatius, and Roman Catholic "councils." The Interpreter of the Scriptures is the Author of the Scriptures (Luke 24:45; Gen. 40:8; Dan. 2:19–23), so the collator of the Canon is the One who divided Isaiah into two sections more than seven hundred years before the birth of Christ: Isaiah 1–39 and Isaiah 40–66, showing you the number of Books that would be contained in both Canons *before either*

"Canon" was complete. The First Advent, with John the Baptist, is in chapter 40 of Isaiah (the first Book to be placed in the New Testament "Canon"), and the New Heavens and New Earth are in chapter 66 of Isaiah (which will show up in Revelation, the twenty-seventh book ending the New Testament Canon).

Sloan did exactly what ninety-five percent of the professors in the Alexandrian Cult have done since 1700. He just imprisoned the Third Person of the Godhead (see John 16:13) and bailed you out with naturalistic humanistic GUESSWORK. Par for the course.

IX. "THE DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT"

Here the faculties and staffs will all bomb out. They can agree that doctrines "differ" in the New Testament. They can figure out that each author has a "particular emphasis" in which he is interested, and they can figure out that the doctrines often "conflict" (although the more conservative in the Cult like to pretend that this is just "apparent discrepancies" which actually constitute "unity in diversity"; i.e., they don't know what they are talking about because God took their minds from them when they began to mess with the Book). In this course, the student will do nothing but examine the verses in each New Testament book to show how the writer has either *added* something about Jesus Christ or *expanded* something about Jesus Christ or *confirmed* something a previous writer said about Jesus Christ. There is no discussion of *development* of doctrines beyond Acts 2.

Colossians 1:15–20; Philippians 2:5–10; John 1:1–18; and 1 Timothy 3:16 are reduced to "hymns," and Philippians 2 is a "hymn" written before Paul wrote Philippians. Proof? Don't be silly. You are studying in a seminary under Dr. Jerry McCant, Professor of Reli-

gion and Christian Education (!) at Point Loma Nazarene College in San Diego. All four "hymns" were attempts to reduce the impact of the *Deity of Christ* and the *Incarnation* on the reader. (Observe how the putting of Old Testament doctrinal passages in "poetic form" [*RSV, NRSV,* NASV, etc.] accomplishes the same thing.)

"Synoptic evangelists stress the Kingdom of God . . . ."[42] Try it again. The word *heaven* is not the word *God* unless you are a pantheist (see *The Sure Word of Prophecy,* 1970). The Kingdom of Heaven is mentioned fifteen times in the first eleven chapters of Matthew, and the Kingdom of God is mentioned twice. The Kingdom of Heaven occurs twenty-seven times in the first fourteen chapters, with only four references to the Kingdom of God, and the word *God* does not occur in two of those references. Mark has the Kingdom of God only fifteen times in sixteen chapters. It is LUKE (writing to Gentiles after reading eighty-five percent of the Pauline Epistles) who says **"kingdom of God"** thirty-two times in twenty-four chapters. Paul defined this Kingdom (Rom. 14:17) as Luke traveled with him, and it was NOT **"the kingdom of heaven"** spoken of by Matthew.

Since no one "challenged the unity of the New Testament" before the *King James Bible,* Dr. McCant thinks it presents a problem. It doesn't, so he gives up and says, "Well there is unity, but within that unity one finds much diversity."

Imagine sitting in a classroom and paying tuition to read the Latin inscription on a one dollar bill "E PLURIBUS UNUM," which is found on every penny and nickel in the United States! Imagine paying tuition to learn THAT!

"In a sense, John practically dispensed with the Parousia."[43]

"If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again to receive you to myself . . . I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory . . . If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? . . . Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him . . . behold, I am come quickly; and my reward is with me . . . Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man . . . The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever . . . . Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

Someone lost their marbles before they got into the game.

To lose your nuts, bolts, and screws along with your marbles, try reading Donald Cuthrie, Hans Conzelmann, J. Weiss, W. Bosset, William Wrede, James D. G. Dunn, Bultmann, Kasemann, C. H. Dodd, E. H. Hoskyns, Noel Davey, Floyd Filson, A. M. Hunter, G. E. Ladd, Leon Morris, and other apostates, backslidders, critics, dead orthodox Conservatives, and unsaved Liberals.

And what further shall we say? For time would fail to describe this massive salad bar and "hot bar," loaded with expensive goodies that will do nothing but put "weight" on your head and turn you into an ineffective, pragmatic humanist who speaks without authority, but rather "as one of the scribes" (Matt. 7:29). True, you will save face (1 Cor. 2:1–2). True, you will have a good "image" (John 12:43). True, you will make more money (1 Tim. 6:10). True, you will get better teaching opportunities and denominational recognition (Luke 16:15), and true, you will probably escape persecution entirely and fit into the New Age as a Global Citizen (1 John 2:15). No " intellectual " or "intelli-

gent person" will ridicule you (Luke 16:14–15), and you will be given credit for having ten times the brains you actually have. In short, from a New Testament Biblical standpoint, you will be a reject, a **"castaway"** (1 Cor. 9:27) with nothing to lay at your Lord's feet (1 Cor. 3; 2 Cor. 5; Rom. 14) but a pile of sawdust, ragweed, dry hay, wood chips, splinters, and burnt grass.

This is the posture of "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM" in the Twentieth Century. The young preachers who are "called to preach" are taught that there is "value" in attacking the Holy Bible. "Critical study can help the preacher develop a preaching strategy, it develops the scholarship of the preacher and it challenges him to preach with integrity," they say. The truth is that "preaching strategy" is developed by studying the sermons of Isaiah, Moses, Jeremiah, Paul, Peter, and Jesus Christ; "Biblical scholarship" is developed by studying the Bible and reading the men who believed it instead of critiquing it; and "integrity" comes from obeying the light you have (James 1:22) and refusing to please anyone but God (2 Tim. 2:15; Gal. 1:9–10; Amos 7:12–17).

Critical studies in Seminaries contribute absolutely NOTHING to what any preacher needs to know. The only critical studies he needs are sharp, plain, blunt, and brutal criticisms of the men and the works that criticize the Book. That is real "higher criticism, " for it is based on the text of the Holy Bible discerning the **"thoughts and intents of the heart"** (Heb. 4:12) of the critic.

"Advanced New Testament Interpretation" will come about completely apart and isolated from archaeological discoveries, Greek grammars, Greek lexicons, redaction, preservation, or "traditions." It will come through prayerful, believing study of the *Authorized* text of the Protestant Reformation, first published in

1611. It has been coming through that medium since 1611, completely apart from every scholar listed in this publication. God chooses His own channels for His own operations, and if there is one thing He makes clear in that Book from cover to cover (Gen. 40; Dan. 2, 5; Luke 24; Isa. 28–29; 1 Cor. 1–3) it is that He doesn't give the "time of day" to any heady, high-minded, conceited, large-worded infidel who thinks he is smarter than the *AV* translators. God is nowhere looking for educated intellects who are interested in propagating their opinions as HIS TRUTH so they can get credit for being "oracles" (1 Cor. 2:1–3).

In Luke 10:21 and Isaiah 66:2, He pointed out, for all the world to see, the "channel" for which He was looking and the *type of man* to whom He would reveal things (see also Psa. 119:98–100 and Isa. 28:9–10). It was not anyone mentioned in this book if they were serving as a faculty member on any school mentioned in this book. The Scriptures not only present Christ and Christology and Progressive Doctrines, they describe in detail the kind of Christian scholar to whom God will reveal truth (Acts 17:11; Ezra 7:6; 1 Cor. 1–3). No man who sat on the revision board of the *RV, NRSV, NASV, NASV, NIV, NEB,* or *NKJV* was described.

When God honors *proper interpretation* of His word (and words) on which He Himself breathed, He never connects it with any man:

1. Who thought *the key* to Biblical interpretation lay in linguistic knowledge or formal education.

2. Who thought *the key* to proper interpretation was the majority opinion of scholars or the teachings of a "church."

3. Who was willing to correct God's words, over and over again, with the opinions of men who had no compassion for souls, no reverence for the Book, no concern about the future, and even no sure testimony

as to their own salvation.

4. Who spent his lifetime with a dead language with which God was no longer concerned one way or another.

5. Who thought they could improve on the *Authorized Version* with either the Greek text of Rome (*Jesuit Rheims*) or the English texts of the *NIV* and *NASV.*

This explains why all "modern expositors" and exegetes who "progressed" beyond Luther and Calvin in New Testament "interpretation," treat genuine Biblical revelations as "HERESIES." *They do so no the grounds of their own laziness and ignorance.* New Testament Biblical interpretation froze in 1929 with Larkin for the Bible-believers; it froze in 1909 for the Fundamentalists and in 1880 for the "orthodox Conservatives." There has been no progress since 1880 apart from Bullinger and Stam where they stuck with the *Authorized text.* Where they departed from it, they too got sunk in theological mud, hubcap high to a Ferris wheel.

"SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM" is the Alexandrian Cult's major heresy, and what it means is simply this: anyone stupid enough to take any scholar's opinion over the words found in the Scriptures, is going to endanger his ministry (if he has one) or prevent him from entering the ministry. "Any scholar," in this context, includes any born-again, saved, soulwinning, militant Fundamentalist who thinks he is smarter than God. "Scholarship Onlyism" does away with the Holy Bible as the ONLY absolutely reliable and authentic source of TRUTH (Mark 7:13). May God save you from such a Christ-dishonoring, God-defying SIN.

X. "BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY"

No College, Seminary or University education would be complete without the Nuzi tablets, the Tel Armarna "diggings," the Moabite Stone, the Behistun

Rock, and Hammurabi's Code. Conservatives and Fundamentalists get more "excited" about digging around in the dirt than "Modernists" or "Liberals," for the simple reason that if they can find anything in any excavation that proves that ANYTHING in the Scripture MIGHT be true, then they can lay it alongside the "discoveries" of Paley, Smith, Libby, Darwin, Leakey, and other monkey men in order to establish the validity of the Biblical account of man against the menagerie account of man.

Unfortunately, not one discovery in favor of the Bible has ever confirmed a creation account over an evolutionary account when it comes to ORIGINS. Harry Rimmer's works on the geological record and Henry Morris' works on the geological record are quite convincing to a Christian, and should be; however, they have never been particularly impressive to any board of faculty members at state Universities or Colleges. Furthermore, Morris' works (and those of the Institute for Creation Research) depend very little on BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY for "proof texts." They deal more (and properly so) with rock strata, thrust faults, meanders, ossiferous fissures, oil deposits, the laws of thermodynamics, "prehistoric" fossils, loess deposits, ephemeral markings, organic and inorganic chemistry, and so forth. Biblical archaeology, on the other hand, is limited to the finding of MATERIAL objects that would indicate that an Old Testament writer was not lying when he made a statement about a custom, historical incident, racial branch, date of a battle, a man's title or name, a local news event, or a description of an event.

The word itself means "the accumulated studies of old or ancient ways of human life." Naturally, there is no real significant study of archaeology until AFTER the publication of the *King James Bible* (see pg.

15). Eighteen hundred is the date given by most historians as the "beginning of a new period." Up until that time, antiquaries simply collected ancient works of art and speculated about the origins and meanings of various artifacts. Jefferson (1799), after doing some digging in Virginia, published some philosophical speculations in the American Philosophical Society. John Frere (1769–1846) messed around with hand axes and tried to prove that man was a good bit "older" than Archbishop Ussher had figured.

The so-called Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages were invented by evolutionists, and once the trade had been established (see *The Anti-Intellectual Manifesto,* chaps. 2, 3), Christian Thomsen, J. J. Worsaae, Jacques Boulcher de Perthes, William Pengelly, Charles Darwin, "Strata" Smith, Alfred Wallace, Augustus Pitt-Rivers, and Gabriel Mortillet went to work. Their work was cut out for them. Their job was to prove the chronological accounts found in Genesis 5, 10, and 11 were a LIE. (See *The Christians Handbook of Science and Philosophy,* 1987, pp. 185–214.)

When Leonard Wooley (1880–1960) found "Ur of the Chaldeas, " every backslidden, dead orthodox Conservative in America and England had him a "spell" (as they say in the "Jubilees" in North Carolina). Here was proof Genesis 12 and Acts 7:2–3 were not LIES!

Why, here was the "moon god" that Abraham's patrimony worshipped, and here was a "ring around the bathtub" to show there had been a flood there at one time, etc. The French archaeologists found "Nineveh," and that proved that there had been such a place. Sir Arthur Evans found Knossos, and James Breasted dug around in Iran so much that by 1990 the *National Geographic Magazine* could print you a large map of Iraq, Iran, Asia Minor, Syria, and Turkey with scores of markings on it to show that Sennacherib used

to live here, Xerxes got whipped there, Alexander the Great kicked the bucket there, Genghis Khan destroyed this and that town there, Mohammed got whipped there, Ahasuerus had his palace there, and so forth and so on.

But all of the mainline archaeologists devoted their lives proving that Genesis 1–12 was a lie. In 1964, Willard Libby's "Carbon 14" showed up to "confirm" the monkey-man account (see *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy,* op cit. pp. 189–236). The evolutionary theory was the TOOL adopted by all of these sinners to "interpret findings." That is, all findings must fit into the monkey man's chart (see p. 17). All findings had to be *dated* so that they would fit into the proper places on the chart (see *The Damnation of a Nation,* p. 27). "Studies of early humans indicate that they may have come to the landmass (America) some 40,000 to 100,000 years ago" (*Funk and Wagnalls New Encyclopedia,* Brain and Dickey, Volume 2, 1966, p. 246).

At this point, our aspiring ministerial student had better stop and think for a few minutes. But of course, if he took his courses in Form and Structural Criticism and Textual and Source Criticism seriously, he has long ago lost the ability to THINK. He is like a devout Catholic who has delivered his conscience to an organization: it is DEAD (see 1 Tim. 4:1–4 and Titus 1:15). In the first place, the information contained in the authors listed above, with the exception of Wooley, is not given to a student studying Biblical Archaeology in a "Fundamentalist" institution. In the second place, if it were, he would only be more athirst to find more ARCHAEOLOGICAL evidence—not Biblical evidence—for his own position.

The idea in the education conspiracy is to offer the sucker **"the key of knowledge"** (Luke 11:52) so he will think that a particular "key" (say a knowledge of

Greek or Hebrew, Manuscript Evidence, Textual Criticism, Greek Grammar, the "grammatico-historico" or the allegorical "method") is the KEY to the Scriptures. This is done to eliminate the Holy Spirit; it is done (by any and all of any profession) to make Biblical truth, Biblical learning, and Biblical interpretation a NATURAL operation carried out by NATURAL means without divine intervention at any point.

This way the College, University or Seminary can be "THE KEEPER OF THE KEYS." (See Rome, for example, on Matt. 16:19 and the next time you see the old wine-headed bachelor under his "Coat of Arms," notice that it contains two KEYS. We will say more about this later.)

From a Biblical standpoint—or rather from the standpoint of a Bible-correcting apostate who makes his living correcting the *King James* text—the surveys of Babylon and Nineveh (1812 and 1820) by C. James Rich, Botta, Layard, Rawlinson, and others, open up the field of "Biblical Archaeology." Hincks (1792–1866) and others deciphered the "Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform," thus furnishing future archaeologists with "an embarrassment of riches" in regards to the culture of Sennacherib, Shalmaneser, Nebuchadnezzar, et al. British and German teams worked for twelve years digging around in the dirt. Clues to the 2130 B.C. culture were found by the Frenchmen (1877), and then they found the tombs of the Sumerian kings, a great palace, well-built houses, and finally the Rosetta Stone (1799). "Discoveries" were made at Mari, Uruk, (now Warka), Nippur (Iraq), Hatra, Kish, Samarra, Wasit, etc. Champollion (1822) deciphered the Rosetta Stone, giving future archaeologists a "wealth of material" with which to work. Sir Flinders Petrie made some discoveries (1894–1895) and up pops slate palettes for cosmetics, carved scenes of hunting and battle, ivory mace

heads, old hieroglyphic texts, wooden furniture, tools, papyrus documents, four hundred clay tablets (Tel el-Amarna) in cuneiform, the name of Ramses (at Tanis) on some stones, and so forth.[44]

Meaning what?

Well, to a stupid young man who is being impressed with man's attempts to find out what man thinks about man, any finding that confirms *anything* mentioned *anywhere* in the Scripture is like gold bullion. Why? It is "evidence that demands a verdict," isn't it? No, it is not. The *evidence,* when presented to the five senses, is rejected at the time it ORIGINATES (see John 12:37). Conclusive *scientific proof* that Jericho's walls fell flat, or that there was straw in the bricks used in Egypt, doesn't compel or put pressure on the HEART of any Christ-rejecting sinner on the face of this earth to believe one word in the Book. First-hand, eyewitness evidence by five hundred eyewitnesses *is rejected on the spot* with proof, on the spot, that the evidence *is scientific* (see 1 Cor. 15:6; Acts 1:3; and Acts 3–6).

The stones may "speak" (Rimmer), or they may "cry out," but their *testimony will* never match that of five hundred eyewitnesses whose testimony was committed to writing on paper more than fourteen hundred years before Columbus discovered America. Do you know what the professional archaeologists said AFTER the excavations on the Euphrates (1972–1976) and Ugarit (1929) and Gath? Do you know what they said after finding evidence for Ahab's "ivory palace," Jezebel's "makeup kit," the tribute payments recorded on the Moabite Stone, David's "gutter" (2 Sam. 5:8) in Jebusi, and the synagogue at Nazareth? Can't you guess? Here it is.

"This earliest stage goes back some 40,000–100,000 years ago, to the time when people first en-

tered the New World"[45] (*Funk and Wagnalls,* op cit. p. 259). "The earliest pottery, possibly dating from 13,000 years ago comes from such a village"[46] (p. 259). "Settlements of hunter-gatherers from between 10,000–15,000 years ago, show that they grew wild yams and taro" (ibid). "Some 30,000 years ago, this area was occupied by groups that established camps near water sources"[47] (op cit. p. 257). "Chronology can be established ABSOLUTELY (get that word!!) with radiocarbon dating, dendrochronology, thermoluminescence, clay varve dating, mass spectrometry, and atomic acclerators"[48] (op cit. p. 247).

After that write down, "Boop boop gettum dottum watum choo!" or "Mairzy doats an dozeey doats and liddle lambsey divey."

The tradesmen invented six more terms to charge you money to learn. *Not ONE of them can date anything before 10,000 B.C. "absolutely."* Liars these days are a dime a dozen with the dime seventy percent copper.

Now what is going on here? Have you begun to notice, by now, how each professor who "specialized" in some discipline (say Greek Grammar, Systematic Theology, Manuscript Evidence, or Form Criticism) seems to feel that HIS field is the essential field (or at least among the top three) that is absolutely necessary for the ministerial student to master if that student is going to "learn the Bible"? Did you notice that?

Someone is trying to sell you **"THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE"** (Luke 11:52), and they are thrusting their "specialization" on you to make you think THEY have the key. *No man listed on the last ten pages has ever had the key.* The key to learning Biblical truth and properly interpreting either Testament is a believing heart and a humble mind, and those "KEYS" are not found in the courses thus far described.

What has been described so far is *professional tradesmen* ($$$) making a living by selling you ($$$) on the idea that without THEIR hobbyhorse you cannot get a complete or a correct understanding of the Scriptures. This is especially conspicuous among the Greek and Hebrew professors who take advantage of the fact that one language (which less than two percent of the world has ever spoken) plus a dead language (Greek—that went out of use seventeen hundred years ago) were used for "original autographs," so knowledge of THOSE languages is the "key" to understanding the Scripture. It never has been since the day the first one was written for EITHER Testament (see John 8:43; Isa. 29:11).

For Cornelius Stam, the "KEY" to understanding the Bible is to segregate Paul's ministry from the ministry of the other apostles. For Hutson and Custer, the "key" is a Greek lexicon or Greek grammar. For Luther, the key was the Gospel. For Calvin, the key was "Sovereign Grace." For Mary Baker Eddy, it was her own book. For a Roman Catholic, the "key" is the dogmatic interpretations of the hierarchy who go by tradition. For a Jew, the "key" would be the Talmud. For the average young man in America called to preach, say between 1890 and 1990, the "key" would be a Christian education in a school that PROFESSED to believe in the "absolute authority of the Bible" and that "all things are to be judged by THE BIBLE." (A brief survey of *The Last Grenade,* [1990] from pages 49–90 will show anyone that "profession is not always possession!")

Back in 1990, a deceived egotist up in Minnesota (I think his name was "Faulstich," or something like that) conned dozens of Christians into thinking that COMPUTERIZED CHRONOLOGY was the "key" to a correct understanding of the Bible. That was the hob-

byhorse in which he "specialized." Chronology, Archaeology, Biology, Greek Grammar, Form Criticism, Catholic Tradition, the Talmud, Numerics, Geology, Mathematics, or ANY other scholarly discipline, is NOT the "key" to understanding either Testament (1 Cor. 2:14; Isa. 6:9–10; Psa. 119:18; Matt. 11:25; and Luke 24:45). Some "Christian" is just pulling your leg to get into your billfold ($$$).

It was Edward Robinson (1795–1863)—AFTER the *King James Bible—who published BIBLICAL Researches in Palestine* (1841). His work was followed by "societies" like the Deutscher-Paliistina-Verein (1878), the Ecole Biblique (1890), The American Schools of Oriental Research (1900), and the British School of Archaeology (1919). Sir Flinders Petrie helped promote another vocabulary for the tradesmen ($$$): stratigraphy, ceramic typology, tels, wadis, etc. William F. Albright went to work after World War I, and excavations were made at Jericho, Megiddo, and Samaria. The "Biblical archaeologists" were Kathleen Kenyon (1906–1978), David Freedman, Yigael Yadin, Benjamin Mazar, Cachman Avigad, and others. They excavated Hazor, Shechem, Ashdod, Taanach, and Gezer after World War II. In the early 1980s, "Biblical" archaeologists worked on Tel el-Hesi, Caesarea, Aphek, Lachish, Akko (Acre), and the "City of David" in Jerusalem. What did they prove according to *Funk and Wagnalls'* encyclopedia? "Evidence thus indicates extensive socio-political disruption and turmoil throughout Palestine at this time, but it does *not* support unequivocally the *Biblical picture* of a complete Israelite conquest"[48a]

1. Joshua is a lie.
2. The dates in the Bible are *incorrect.*
3. The Biblical "picture" is a picture that is not absolutely true, but Carbon 14 experiments *are* abso-

lutely true (see above).

What did the scholars think after the Dead Sea Scrolls were unearthed, the tablets at Ras Shamra were found, the Gnostic and Coptic texts were found at Nag Hammadi, and the Nuzis and Nazis and Nutzies were found?

"These writings have proved invaluable for understanding the EVOLUTION OF CHRISTIANITY in Egypt, especially in its nonorthodox forms . . . These materials have provided valuable information about the state of the Biblical text . . . they have also supplied important data supporting the *Greek version* of the Pentateuch, and other books, as a reliable witness to a Hebrew *original* that was different from the text used as a source of modem Bible texts . . . The Qumran scrolls and other manuscript fragments along the western shores of the Dead Sea, since 1947, have REVOLUTIONIZED the understanding of later Jewish history and of *New Testament background.*"[49]

1. Nothing "evolves" (see above). The word is a misnomer that applies to nothing on this earth—organic, inorganic, idealistic, abstract, concrete, individual, or corporate.

2. How does he know what THE BIBLICAL text was by the "state" that he finds recorded in SOME copies of SOME text, written by SOMEONE?

3. "Greek version of the Pentateuch?" Why, bless my soul, everyone of these liars (saved and lost alike) have said for over three hundred years that it was a Greek OLD TESTAMENT—not just a "Greek version of the PENTATEUCH!" Hey, you double-shuffling, two-faced, prevaricating "preambulators around the pole of veracity," when did you decide that the Greek *LXX* (Septuagint) was just *five books* (the Pentateuch) instead of thirty-nine, plus the Apocrypha?

4. No background of any New Testament was

"revolutionized " by one discovery of any archaeologist in the last five hundred years. The rascal meant "the background of the TIMES in which the New Testament was written had one or two items in it, OF NO SIGNIFICANCE TO ONE BOOK IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, about which historians had not known up till then." See how they set you up? Beautiful, isn't it? Do you know what these God-forsaken enemies of the Holy Bible have done? They have implanted two things in your mind (see Gen. 3:1): That you can no longer believe the New Testament like you did before the "revolution" came, and your belief has been made "passe" by BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.

5. The Greek Septuagint, written between A.D. 120 and 400 (Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Symmachus, Sinaiticus, Origen, Theodosius, et al.), should be used to correct the Hebrew Bible given to the Hebrews as **"THE ORACLES OF GOD"** (Rom. 3:2)

Arid who believed these Satanic implants? Well, one of five thousand was Dr. Stewart Custer, head of the Bible Department at Bob Jones University (1981).

Custer, when faced with proving the existence of a pre-Christian Greek Old Testament (not a "Pentateuch") went completely to pieces and instead of answering the challenge (the challenge was for him to cite *one verse* from *one book* in the Old Testament that a New Testament writer quotes from a Greek Old Testament manuscript written before the completion of the New Testament [p. 18, *The Truth about the KJV Controversy,* BJU Press], his "answer" was: 1) Ruckman fabricated a theory. 2) There is no evidence for the theory. 3) There is a list of manuscripts AROUND A.D. 50–90—but none of them were listed by Custer or the man he cites (Patrick Skehan, op cit., p. 19).

Custer wasn't asked for a Greek manuscript written during New Testament times (A.D. 30–90); he was

asked for ONE VERSE quoted by one New Testament writer that was from an Old Testament Greek Bible written before the completion of the New Testament. Neither he nor Skehan cited ONE verse from the "embarrassment of riches" to which they had access: not one. 4) "Esther," in Greek, was in circulation in 75 B.C. Proof. Custer couldn't even give ONE reference for his fabricated theory: not ONE .[50]

5) He cites a scroll of the twelve Minor Prophets in Greek, called "R." Since it was dated by someone in the First Century, this is proof that the New Testament writers quoted from it. Custer doesn't give you *one reference* citing one verse that any New Testament writer quoted from "R." 6) Rylands Papyrus 458—which we already listed in our work on *Manuscript Evidence,* "The Mythological Septuagint," chapter 4, 1970—is dated 150 B. C. Not one writer in the New Testament quotes one word from it.

7) The next earliest example of the Greek Deuteronomy text (848) is dated about 40 B.C. Not *once* did Stewart Custer produce *one* word of *one* verse quoted by *one* New Testament writer from any Greek manuscript written before A.D. 90. Not one. And what did that poor, deluded, deceived, egotistical supporter of the *NASV* say when he got through writing nothing that dealt with anything? He said (so help me, Westcott and Hort): "WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FACTS?" (ibid.)

The student wasn't given *any* facts. Shehan's Greek manuscripts "written before A.D. 90" were not *listed,* they were not *quoted,* they were not discussed. The joke about Esther was left entirely unsupported with no documentation at all behind it. The "R" scroll was not quoted by ANY writer in the New Testament, and that is why Custer didn't even tell you what was in that papyrus. At Bob Jones University this is what they call

"FACTS."

What Custer had to deal with (with which he never attempted to deal) was this statement from a book we printed twenty-two years ago (1970). Custer quotes this statement,[51] but then, *having lost his ability to read,* he forgot what the statement was when he sat down to comment on it. The statement (buy Custer's book and READ it, p. 18) was as follows: "To this day no scholar has ever produced ONE Greek copy of the Old Testament written before 300 A.D." Read it. Buy *The Truth About the KJV Controversy* and read it.

1. Is an "R" copy of the Minor Prophets a "copy of a Greek Old Testament"? I thought an Old Testament had more in it than Minor Prophets! Is a copy of Esther a "copy of a Greek Old Testament"? Has someone lost their mind? You bet your booties they have! Is a fragment of Deuteronomy a "copy of a Greek Old Testament"? I thought an Old Testament had thirty-nine books in it? Have I been deceived?

Why, the implications, bless your cotton-pickin', everloving, blue-eyed soul, honey, are that Steward Custer has a remedial reading problem that he should have solved in the fourth grade. After completely ignoring the challenge and doing everything but deal with the FACTS, this mentally crippled, incompetent Alexandrian says, "These quotations (New Testament) from the Septuagint are *THE INFALLIBLE* WORD OF THE LIVING GOD (Mr. Ruckman's opinions to the contrary not withstanding)."

Do you know what quotations Custer cited when he said, "THESE QUOTATIONS"? He cited Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, written more than two hundred years *after* the completion of the New Testament. Just like we said.

When asked for ONE quotation of ONE verse from ANY Greek Old Testament written before A.D. 90, the

head of the Bible (!!) Department at BJU gave you THREE quotations from a Greek Old Testament written two hundred years *after* the New Testament had been *written.* Read it. Buy a copy from the BJU press and read it. (Note, this work is now out of print and no longer available.)

That is, if you still have the ability to READ and THINK. Custer lost his before he got on the faculty at BJU. But as we have already noted, this is "par for the course" in higher Christian education.[52]

Now what brought Steward Custer to his "last stand"? Easy; BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY. Someone digging around in the "diggin's," dug up some trash; and all of the backslidden, powerless, apostate Conservatives and Fundamentalists—who had been making a living ($$$) selling "keys" to the Scripture—availed themselves of another humanistic, naturalistic gimmick to sidetrack the ministerial student from studying and believing the Scriptures that God gave him. Instead, he was led to believe that at any moment some " revolutionary," "exciting new discovery," some "shocking new find that puts new light on the blankety-blank," could show up and UNHORSE him from the saddle, destroying his confidence in what he had learned that was TRUE so far.

This is the work of higher education as it "progressively" seeks "advances in learning new methods" for "finding more truth." It creates looney birds who can't read. To this day, not one scholar, living or dead (of any persuasion or profession), has ever cited ONE verse in the New Testament that a New Testament writer is quoting from a Greek Old Testament written before A.D. 120—thirty years after the close of the Canon of the New Testament. Not one. Every New Testament quotation cited by Swete, Skehan, Custer, Albright, Edward Hills, Dean Burgon, Donald Waite,

Zane Hodges, James Price, Westcott, Hort, Bob Jones III, Fred Afman, Gleason Archer, and the faculties and staffs of BBC, PCC, Santa Rosa, Lynchburg, Tennessee Temple, Wheaton, Moody, Fuller, and Dallas Theological Seminary in all of their classes, works, sermons, publications, and speeches, *is from Greek Old Testaments written more than two hundred years after John died on Patmos.*

BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, obviously, is not the "key" to anything. Where it occasionally confirms the *AV* text it may be complimented for having discovered something that is true. Where it unearths "exciting new discoveries that have revolutionized the rethinking of the blankety blank blank blank," it is just a con man's gaff for hooking suckers ($$$).

If "Biblical" archaeologists unearthed an Aramaic copy of Matthew tomorrow and proved it was written in A.D. 33 by a Carbon 14 test, it would be just about as significant to proper interpretation of Matthew as *The Gospel of Judas Iscariot* or a Papal Bull. But boy! would the backslidden, apostate Fundamentalists have a time with that! Why, if that happened, every leading Christian celebrity in America would be forced to "reconsider," "rethink the Synoptics," "reevaluate the Pope's claim to supremacy," "reexamine the Gospel imperatives," etc., because of the "revolutionary discovery" that "shocked the world of Biblical scholarship," etc., *ad nauseum.*

"If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them . . . meddle not with them that are given to change . . . either to tell, or to hear some new thing . . . there is no new thing under the sun . . . ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein . . . Come unto me . . . for I am meek and lowly in heart."

That last quotation has been revised by every ma-

jor Christian Seminary, University, and College in America to read, "Come unto me because I am highly qualified and spiritually equipped to pass on to you THE KEYS OF KNOWLEDGE which made me superior to the 'laymen' who have been denied the hidden wisdom of the ancients!" This is how "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM" advertises itself.

In an extremely brief general survey of "Scholarship Onlyism" (like this survey), we could not possibly take you page by page through Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (edited by Gerhard Friedrich), to show you the thousands of ways—literally THOUSANDS—that a Bible-perverting apostate (who professes to believe in plenary, verbal inspiration) can attack the Holy Bible and alter it to suit his idiosyncrasies or match his stupidity. It would take four hundred pages to show you how Kenneth Wuest did it in his *Nuggets,* and another one thousand pages to show you how Nicoll did it in *The Expositor's Greek New Testament.*

Many years ago, I had a brief encounter with a typical Alexandrian champion. He was a backslidden Baptist "evangelist" who dropped out of the ministry after deciding to devote his life to attacking the *King James Bible.* I will use him as an example, because in the brief format which he presented, he pulled off at least TWENTY ruses that all Alexandrians use in trying to overthrow the words of God.

This young dude said that he could *prove* that there were TEN definite *errors* in the *King James Bible.* He was firmly convinced that he could prove these ten errors "beyond the reasonable shadow of a doubt" (that is American criminal jurisprudence), and to do it, he would avail himself of the standard Christian Seminary education described in this book. He had no Seminary education himself, but he was going to use all of

their material to prove his point, and he did just that. Unfortunately, he underestimated my reading ability. He actually planned to use one translation (not any Greek text) to make all ten corrections on the *King James Bible,* and the English text he was going to use was the *NKJV.* Under the guise of going by the Greek "Textus Receptus," he was going to convert my audience to *NKJV* people. (I think the silly nut didn't think I had access to a *NKJV.* I found all ten of his changes printed out in it before any debate started.)

Briefly, here are the "ten," and these ten may serve as par excellent examples of how any young man called to preach can be deceived by Satan in appealing to his intellect and then brainwashed into thinking he can prove something he cannot prove, finally, completely disqualifying himself from the ministry, permanently, on the grounds of LYING AND MISREPRESENTING *THE TRUTH.*

1. The first time he bombed out was on Acts 2:40— **"save yourselves."** Being stupid enough to believe that the "plan of salvation" for Judean Jews in Jerusalem and Jews of the Dispersion in Jerusalem (on a Jewish feast day, BEFORE Paul had written a word about **"the gospel of the grace of God"**) was identical to Ephesians 2:8–9, this young fool decided the middle voice should have been translated PASSIVE (σώθντε). Equating Simon Peter's Pentecostal discourse with Galatians 1:8 (when the author of Galatians 1 had not even been saved yet), this Alexandrian upstart tried to convert Acts 2:40 into a salvation by grace setup where no one DID anything to get saved. He did this after reading what they were told to DO to get the Holy Spirit (see vss. 38–39), which Paul never told anyone to do (see Gal. 3:14). Higher education had destroyed the young man's ability to READ and to THINK.

In the same chapter, an aorist PASSIVE (2:26

"ηὐφράνθη") is translated as an ACTIVE, and in Luke 9:26 (same author as Acts) "ἐπαισχυνθῇ" is translated as an ACTIVE voice with an object; it is not a passive. If Acts 2:40 had been a passive form, it would not have determined HOW it should be translated. Furthermore, no one in Acts 2 was told how to be saved from HELL; they were told to save themselves from the generation *that rejected the Messiah.* Read the verse.

In typical Alexandrian fashion, this child suddenly forgot how to read his own tongue, English. Furthermore, as most "Greek scholars," he didn't know enough Greek to open a restaurant. In James 4:7, it says, **"SUBMIT YOURSELVES"** (*passive* aorist imperative), and this is habitually translated in the *middle* voice. It is not "be brought into submission" (passive), but **"submit yourselves"** (middle). (The ridiculous *NKJV,* hopelessly lost in the muddle, translated it as PASSIVE.) But Gary Hudson's troubles (the Alexandrian's real name) were only starting. Tyndale and the *Geneva Bible,* with the *ASV* and *RSV*, had all followed the *King James* reading. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown stated that "Luke's fluency in classical Greek (not KOINE) confirms his Gentile origin . . . he would have had every advantage of cultivating the literature of Greece." Julius Mantey (*A Manual of The Greek New Testament,* 1928, p. 157) says there were only two voices in the original Indo-Germanic: "the MIDDLE ENDINGS ARE THE ORIGINAL FORM." Robertson says (*A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament,* 1931, p. 289), "The indirect MIDDLE is connected with water baptism twice in Acts 22 . . . the PASSIVE developed later (p. 290): 'WASH AWAY FOR THYSELF.'"

Poor little "Gary Poo" lost himself in the English text, in the English words, in the Greek words, in the Greek grammars, and in all the Greek texts extant. Like most Alexandrians, he simply didn't know where

he was or what he was doing. Total irresponsibility.

2. Having proved that he knew nothing about Old Testament salvation or salvation in the transition books (Matthew, Acts, and Hebrews), he adopted the *NKJV* reading for Romans 8:24 and claimed **"we are saved by hope"** was an error.

Once again, trying to read Paul's salvation of Ephesians 2:8–9 into every text, Gary decided that "ἐλπίδι" meant "IN HOPE." Not being familiar with Robertson's "eight case system," Gary said the ending was DATIVE. It couldn't have been. A dative ending would have been "SAVED TO HOPE" or "SAVED AT HOPE." The word was in the INSTRUMENTAL case. There was no reference to spiritual salvation in the context, but it was the completion of spiritual salvation, which is PHYSICAL salvation (1 John 3:1–3; Phil. 3:21). Our **"blessed hope"** (see Tit. 2:13) is Jesus Christ (Heb. 8:1–9), when talking about PHYSICAL salvation. We are saved **"by hope."**

The Greek texts all have an *article* before hope (τῇ ψὰρ ἐλπίδι εησώθημεν). If you had said "IN HOPE," you would have confounded the theology of the entire New Testament. (The *RSV,* with the *NKJV,* says "IN THIS HOPE WE WERE SAVED.") We weren't anything of the kind, and there is no "this" in ANY Greek text. There are two "hopes" in Romans 8. There is the **"blessed hope"** of Titus for the man who is already saved, and there is the UNCONSCIOUS hope of the brute creation waiting liberation. The unsaved man's hope is a FALSE HOPE. He is alone in the world with **"no hope"** (Eph. 2:12). *Nobody was saved IN any hope.* We were saved when we were **"dead in trespasses and sins"** (Eph. 2:1). The "hope" of Romans 8 is **"the redemption of our body"** (vs. 23), which no man has until AFTER he is saved. Bullinger; "THE CREATION IS WAITING AND HOP-

ING"—and it was not even spiritually saved in any sense (see vss. 20–22).

Higher Christian education can destroy your ability to READ and THINK.

3. Having struck out two times out of two "at bats," Gary crashed into Luke 9:43 to prove "error" in the *AV*. He said **"the mighty power of God"** should read with the *RSV* of the National Council of Christian Churches; this is the reading of the *NKJV*. The Greek word here was "μεγαλειότητι," translated as **"MAJESTY"** in 2 Peter 1:16 and **"magnificence"** in Acts 19:27.

Knowing little or nothing about the English text of the *King James Bible,* Gary failed to notice that the Holy Spirit used the word **"MAJESTY"** twenty-six times in the Old Testament and six times in the New Testament; *not one time* did it ever refer to Jesus Christ doing anything in the "body of his humiliation." Every reference, in both Testaments, was to God or Christ in GLORY or at the Advent on **"the throne of his glory"** (Matt. 25:31). In 2 Peter 1:16, Peter was referring to Christ coming in glory at the Second Advent (see Matt. 16:28), so His **"majesty"** was a reference to His TRANSFIGURED, *GLORIFIED* body.

You couldn't have translated "μεγαλειότητι" any worse than the *NKJV* (and Gary Hudson) did in Luke 9:43 if you tried. **"Majesty"** is never connected with Christ's humiliation state in thirty-two references. (The lexicon even gives *glory* as an alternative to **"majesty."**) The reader should examine Psalm 45:3–4, 93:1, 96:6, 104:1, 145:12; Isaiah 2:10, 19, 21, 26:10l. Gary didn't know where the verses were, but if he had found them he had already proved that he couldn't have READ them in English.

4. Then, like the perfect fool he was—and this is nothing exceptional among *King James Bible* correc-

tors—Gary decided that **"replenish"** in Genesis 1:28 was an error and it should be simply "FILL." He found this in a Hebrew-Chaldean lexicon, so he figured the Holy Bible had to be in error. That's how all Alexandrians figure. Here, the Hebrew texts all read *"male"* (מָלֵא). It is translated as **"replenish"** in Genesis 1:28 and 9:1. Poor Gary, just as naive and as stupid as the men who taught him, didn't read his own translation. The same word is translated as **"replenished"** in Jeremiah 31:25; Isaiah 2:6, 23:2; and Ezekiel 26:2, 27:25. In *all five cases* it was the restoration of a previous condition: it was rich and then poor, it got joy back that it had lost, it had done it before, and someone is being REFILLED after being empty.

As far back as 1821, Bacon said *replenish* meant "to recover former fullness." Poor Gary was going to try to prove that "originally" the word *replenish,* in English was not to "redo" anything. He was going to do prove this with *Webster's Student Dictionary* (G. C. Merriman and Co., 1960, p. 695), which says, "To stock, to supply fully, to fill again, ESPECIALLY AFTER HAVING BEEN EMPTIED." Webster (p. 313) said it came from the Latin compound *re* plus *plenus.* The *re* meant "again," and the *plenus* meant "to get full."

Here, where the *AV* text gave an *advanced revelation* not found in the Hebrew lexicon (!!), all the Cult members simply went to pieces. You can see why.

5. Well, having blown it in four out of four, Gary had too good a thing going to stop. He stepped back up to the roaring Lion of the Protestant Reformation and tried (bare-handed) to extract a jaw tooth from 2 Peter 1:1. Here Gary said that the *AV* had slighted the Deity of Christ because it should have read "the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ" instead of **"the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus**

Christ." (This is the kind of God-forsaken mess you get into when you take higher Christian education seriously.)

The "modern English translations" that read the way Gary thought they should (to magnify the Deity of Christ), called Joseph Christ's "father" in Luke 2:33 (*ASV* and *RSV*), called Christ God's "servant" instead of His **"child"** in Acts 4:27, and denied His incarnation in 1 Timothy 3:16 (*ASV, NASV, RSV,* and *NRSV*).

Observe the word **"and"** inserted *between* God and Saviour, or God and Father, or God and Jesus in 1 Timothy 1:1; Titus 1:4; 1 Corinthians 1:3; 2 Timothy 1:2; 2 Timothy 4:1; and 1 Corinthians 8:6, without ANYONE complaining about it subtracting from the Deity of Christ. This figure is called a *hendiadys.* It is so clear in Isaiah 45:21 that you couldn't miss it if you couldn't hit the broad side of a barn with a bunch of bananas. Does anyone think that Jacob AND Israel are two *different* people in Isaiah 44:1? What cockeyed nut would think that **"the King of Israel"** was not the **"redeemer"** of Isaiah 44:6?

Hendiadys ("one by means of two") is such a common Hebraism that no reader of the Old Testament could possibly have any trouble with Paul in Romans 16:27, and think that Jesus was not "God manifest in the flesh" because He was given as the *instrument* through which God gets glory.

Who could possibly get such a thing messed up except some ambitious, stupid young man so full of himself that he couldn't read his own language after studying it in school for eighteen years? One of the first maxims of textual criticism is that you should choose a reading that resembles "what the author was more likely to have written; the style of the author throughout the book" (Metzger, *The Practice of New Testament Criticism,* Oxford, 1968, p. 210). Did Gary

read 2 Peter 1:2? Of course not. If he had, he would have noticed that Peter continually puts the possessive pronoun (*hemon*—ἡμῶν) before **"JESUS CHRIST,"** not **"GOD."** The construction is found in 2 Peter 1:2, 8, 11, 14, 16, and 2:20 and shows up again in 1 Peter 1:3. With Peter's style demonstrated in front of his face, in Greek, *SIX TIMES in the same chapter,* Gary couldn't understand the text in Greek *or* English.

Ditto Robert Dick Wilson on Revelation and Daniel, and ditto Dr. A. T. Robertson on Job and Matthew, ditto G. Gresham Machen on Hebrews and James, and ditto Kenneth Wuest on ANYTHING.

6. Having fallen to pieces five out of five times in combat with the Monarch of the Books, little Gary now tried his strength on Hebrews 10:23 in the hopes that "ἐλπίδος" could ONLY be translated as "hope" instead of **"faith"** (as the *AV* has it). "The translator should avoid a tendency to translate word for word, for to do so is to destroy the MEANING of the original (Prof. Nida), fundamental principles of translation; the translator must understand *perfectly* the CONTENT AND INTENTION of the author of whom he is translating" (Eugene Glassman, *The Translation Debate,* InterVarsity Press, 1981, p. 32). "Some have such a fetish for correctness, they completely overlook the far deeper question of 'CORRECT FOR WHOM?'"

Normally "ἐλπὶσ" is HOPE and "πίστις" is FAITH. But have you proved ERROR in the *AV* because it didn't follow the normal procedure here? Well, page 522 of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* Vol. II, Eerdmans, 1964, says, "HOPE is closely linked with TRUST, this hope is closely linked with TRUST . . . this hope is thus TRUST . . . this HOPEFUL TRUST is always demanded."

When Gary tired to limit the meaning to one word (*hope*), he fell afoul of every concordance in the coun-

try. *The Standard Lexicon* (p. 133) gives "confidence" as an alternative translation; "EXPECTATION" was used by the *NASV* for the same word (ἐλπίδος). The truth is that you do not "hold fast" to a profession of anything but what you SAY you believe (1 Tim. 6:12–14), and here, the context was believing verses 10–17, not "hoping" anything. Robertson and Davis say (p. 211), "Try the meaning of each case IN THE ACTUAL CONTEXT." Volume V of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (pg. 207) says, "Trust is very closely related to HOPE. *FAITH* in God's promises is also HOPE. This, indeed, is the PREDOMINANT SENSE in Hebrews 11."

Something was terribly lacking in Gary's education, and we have noticed that the men who taught the men who taught HIM are just as lacking. Many English words have three to five different meanings, and the same is true in Spanish and French. The German word *LUST*, for example, has six different meanings in English: "wish," "inclination," "desire," "enjoyment," "pleasure," and "delight."

In the case before us, where Gary took the reading of the *NKJV* for Hebrews 10:23, the poor child forgot that the English text he had adopted (the *NKJV*) had just translated the verb "παρακαλέω" FOUR different ways: "implore" (Phil 4:2), "urge" (2 Cor. 2:8), "plead" (Luke 7:3), and "appeal" (Heb. 13:22). And now this Alexandrian tried to tell you "ἐλπίδος" could only be translated ONE way!

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22).

7. But why stop now? Just because you demonstrated *six times in a row* that you didn't know your own Bible in your own language and couldn't handle ANY Greek word in ANY text, from any Greek Testament, why quit? A. T. Robertson didn't; and neither

did Spiros Zodhiates, Curtis Hutson, Kenneth Wuest, James Price, or Zane Hodges. Go on with it! Show them what "Scholarship Onlyism" can do for a God-called preacher!

Back up to the top of the mountain goes Gary Poo to take on "The King of the Mountain" again, who has just slapped him senseless six times and pitched him off a five thousand foot cliff. First Corinthians 1:21 is in "error" in the *King James.* It should have been "the foolishness of the *MESSAGE* preached" instead of **"the foolishness of preaching."** Here, the Greek word "κνρὺψματος" has been converted from **"preaching"** to "MESSAGE," so the sissified little fruit loops of 1950–1990 will not look like FOOLS in their "calling." This, inspite of the fact that the same apostle, in the the same epistle, told them to become FOOLS (1 Cor. 3:18) because that great preacher said we were **"fools for Christ's sake"** (1 Cor. 4:10). But slick, smooth apostates like Doug Kutilek, Robert Sumner, Stewart Custer, Gary Hudson, Bob Jones III, et al., *don't want to look like fools.* They want to be "respectable," so they want to make Bible PREACHING a respectable thing: not a foolish thing. You see, heart motive is often behind "a more accurate reading from the Greek text, etc."

Can the King of the Mountain handle the faculties and staffs who trained the teachers who taught Gary? Well, I reckon so! He never had any trouble putting down the Popes, John Calvin, kings, presidents, Spurgeon, Martin Luther, Bob Jones III, Madonna, Castro, R. D. Wilson, Kenneth Wuest, Kittel, Delitzsch, or Billy Graham where they erred!

The *NKJV* reading for "the message" vanishes in Matthew 12:41; Romans 16:25; and 1 Corinthians 2:4. In those places the same word (κνρυγμά) was translated as "PREACHING." And why shouldn't it be?

The Analytical Greek Lexicon (1970, pg. 230) says "PREACHING." *Geneva* and *Tyndale* said "PREACHING."

This time our shallow, stupid Bible critic had to cross the scholarship of the *RV* committee, the *NASV* committee, the *RSV* and the *NRSV* committees, as well as the *Authorized Version.* Gary, this time, not only had to set himself above the Holy Bible (and all those who believed it), but all of his own crowd who didn't believe it and (like him) spent their lifetimes correcting it! On page 716 of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. III). It says "KERUGMA IS THE ACT OF PROCLAIMING . . . Christian preaching does not persuade hearers by beautiful or clever words. Preaching does more. KERUGMA is the apostolic office of PREACHING."

Note how careful apostates like Hudson were to translate the "article" in order to pervert the verse (*tou kerugmatos*—του κνρυγματος). They hoped you would notice this and be won over to their perversion of the truth on the grounds that the *AV* (and *RSV, NIV, ASV, NASV, Tyndale, Geneva, The Great Bible,* and the *Bishops' Bible)* forgot to translate it. No such luck. The *NKJV* and Gary Hudson failed to translate three articles IN THE SAME VERSE. In verse 21, there is an article before God (*Theos*) THREE times. THEY DIDN'T TRANSLATE IT ONE TIME. Nice folks, aren't they? Translate an article when you want to prove a *lie;* leave it untranslated if putting it in *doesn't* teach a lie. Nice folks. Nothing but the best. Now Gary really has blown it, for he was counting on a lexicon to be his final authority to correct the Holy Bible (see the two cases just noted: Heb. 10:23 and Luke 9:43). But now his "final authority" has made a liar out of him. It said "kerugma" meant "PREACHING," as the *AV* said.

Down the mountain side you go again, sonny, with

your shirt off your back, your nose bloodied, both your eyes blackened, and your pants **"old cast clouts"** (Jer. 38:11) and in rags. The King (1611) is never bothered with people like you or the men who taught you.

But never mind! "Don't give up the ship!" "We have only begun to fight!" "If at first you don't succeed . . . ." (The insane asylums are filled with optimists.) You understand, this pipsqueak said he could PROVE TEN ERRORS in a *King James Bible.* He said he could do it. He bragged about having done it. He is still claiming to have done it after bombing out seven times in a row.

8. Matthew 14:9 is an error. It should have been "OATHS" instead of **"for the oath's sake"** (AV). The Greek texts read "καί λυπηθείς ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους"—with some minor variations affecting "λυρηθεὶς". (The Textus Receptus has "δια δε" for "δια" by itself.) But Gary is not picking any bones here. He is pointing out the plural "OATHS" is correct and **"the oath's sake"** is incorrect. How will he do this? By prayer? No. By seeking God's mind on the matter? No. By **"comparing spiritual things with spiritual"** (1 Cor. 2:13)? No. Gary is a typical educated Alexandrian. He believes in "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM."

But this time, forty years of formal education wouldn't help Albert Einstein out of the mess. You see, there are no oaths in the passage. There is ONE oath (v. 7) in both Gospels (Mark 6:23). Tyndale saw the problem back in the Sixteenth Century. So did the translators of the *Geneva Bible.* Gary Hudson and Curtis Hutson—he was on the overview committee of the *NKJV*—couldn't see the problem, so they just made a liar out of God and went to "the Greek" to *CREATE* a contradiction. The shallow scholars of 1980–1990 were four hundred years RETROGRADE in knowledge.

Translating "ὅρκους" as a *plural* is nothing but a grossly stupid (and inferior) thing to do to solve a genuine problem in transmitting truth. Thank God the *AV* translators (more than 370 years ago) had more spirituality and scientific methodology (and intelligence) than our modern Conservative and Fundamental Seminary graduates.

Now first, before consulting the supreme, final, and infallible authority for **"the words of truth"** (Prov. 22:21) to find the truth, let us resort to Gary's Alexandrian peers and "mentors" who screwed up his mind and got him into the mess in which he presently finds himself: a hopeless liar who has been proven to be a liar seven out of seven times in his profession of being able to prove error in the Holy Bible.

Glassman (op cit., p. 121) "Avoid misleading translations . . . avoid ambiguity." What could be more misleading and ambiguous than to convert a single oath into "OATHS?" Callow (*Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God,* Zondervan, 1974, pp. 10–11): "The problem facing the translator is this: how can he access the MEANING of the original and state it ACCURATELY in the form of propositions, so that the original may be conveyed as clearly and as NATURALLY as possible . . . the task of the translator is to communicate information" (p. 69).

"THE MEANING OF THE ORIGINAL," when you pick up the Scriptures, is only known to the *Author* of the Scriptures, and He says that He withholds that "meaning" from every man on the face of this earth who picks up that Book with an idol in his HEART (Ezek. 14:1–11; 2 Thess. 2:11–12; 2 Chron. 18:18–21). That is the first, fundamental Biblical principle of scientific Biblical scholarship. See it illustrated twice in Daniel 2:4–10 and 5:7–8; and again in John 8:43, 47. Formal learning and higher education are not the

determining factors. They have not been the determining factors one time since Genesis 37:5–6.

Now look at the Book. The *NKJV* committee, who pulled off this boo-boo, translated "σαββάτων" as singular in Matthew 28:1. So did the *RV, RSV, NRSV, ASV, NASV, NIV,* and *NEB.* The same publications translated "*Elohim*" and "*Shaniayim*" as SINGULARS (Old Testament) more than two hundred times. Likewise, the *NKJV* (here cited to correct the *AV*) translated "οὐρανῶν" (PLURAL) as "Heaven" (SINGULAR) in Matthew 19:12. All three words: *Sabbath*, *God*, and *Heaven* were PLURAL FORMS TRANSLATED AS SINGULARS. Furthermore, that wretched counterfeit of the Holy Bible (the *NKJV*) translated "ἐλεημοσύνην", in Acts 3:3, as a PLURAL. It is not a plural in any one of over two thousand manuscripts; it is a SINGULAR.

Now if you don't have a high school education, you can still see something at one glance. If Hudson can claim that a singular translation of a plural Greek word is proof of error in the *AV* text, he: 1) violates his own rules of translating, 2) contradicts five hundred men (the combined committees of the *ASV*, *NASV*, *RSV*, *NRSV*, *NIV*, *NKJV*, and *AV*), 3) gives you an ambiguous reading that misleads you, 4) demonstrates his ignorance of the Book he is reading in GREEK. In the same book, by the same author (Matthew), we find "διάτὴν βασιλείαω τῶν οὐρανων," which is translated by the *NKJV* as *"the kingdom of heaven."* Better than that, this time the "σταδια" precedes the expression exactly as the "δια" was found before "τοὐς ὄρκους." That isn't all. The manner in which the *ASV*, *NASV*, *RV*, *RSV*, *NRSV*, *NIV*, and *NKJV* translated Matthew 19:12 was IDENTICAL to the way the *AV* translated the plural in Matthew 14:9.

Observe! **"For the kingdom of heaven's sake"**

(Matt. 19:12), with "HEAVEN" as a PLURAL in all manuscripts. **"For the oath's sake"** (Matt. 14:9), with "OATH" as a plural in all manuscripts. Both constructions were identical.

What happened to Gary's MIND while he was studying Greek to find errors in the *AV* by using "THE GREEK TEXT"? You get one guess.

It is impossible for the reader to grasp the horrendous significance of this type of thing we are demonstrating here, because the one case we are using here is absolutely standard and typical of the approach, called "the historic position" of every apostate, Bible-correcting "Fundamentalist" in the United States. This case stands for five hundred cases a day! Gary is pursuing his course of traumatic lying on the following assumptions which are all taught as ABSOLUTE TRUTH at Bob Jones University, Pensacola Christian College, Moody, Fuller, Wheaton, Liberty University, Stetson, Judson, Howard, Tennessee Temple, Baptist Bible College, Furman, Wake Forrest, Louisville Theological Seminary, and the twenty Colleges listed in the appendices of *"Errors" in the King James Bible.*

1. The *King James Bible* is NOT **"scripture."***

2. Only the unread, unseen, uncollected "originals" are *Scripture.*

3. There are no perfect translations. God would not give ANY translation **"by inspiration"** (2 Tim. 3:16).

4. You can call some translation "the Word of God" as long as you mean it contains the "fundamentals of the faith" or the "message" of God. (This is the Neo-orthodoxy taught at Bob Jones, BBC, and Pensacola Christian College).

5. You can *call* some translation "Scripture" because you *think* you have at least ninety-nine percent of what God MAY HAVE SAID, if you refer to nine

Greek New Testaments and five different English versions.

6. "THE GREEK TEXT" is the final authority in practice, whether it is an Alexandrian Greek text of Bob Jones University (*NASV* from Nestle) or a Syrian Greek text of BBC (Textus Receptus or "Majority" Text).

7. There are no perfect Greek manuscripts of "THE" Greek text; they too all have errors.

8. Therefore, the man who knows more GREEK than any other man not only has access to more truth than Martin Luther, Billy Sunday, J. Frank Norris, or John Knox , but he is also better equipped to correct ALL Greek texts and ALL translations with as many corrections as he wants to make in order to bring them into line with his own *opinion.* He is a self-made, self-created "god" (see Gen. 3).

This is the posture, or "stance," that Gary Hudson took in order to "prove" the eight "errors" you just studied. Coincidentally, it is the exact posture and stance of the Greek and Hebrew faculties of every College, Seminary, and University listed in *"Errors" in the King James Bible* (over twenty of them), *The Last Grenade* (another twenty), *The Bible Believers Bulletin* (forty more), and every religious school in Europe. This is an one hundred-year-old educational conspiracy designed to get rid of, or nullify, ONE BOOK; and it is not any book in Greek, German, Spanish, French, Hebrew, Russian, Tamil, Japanese, or Portuguese.

One more time, eh, "Stout Heart"? One more time back up the mountain to take on the roaring English Lion of the Protestant Reformation and convert him into an ecumenical pussycat, clothed in a Roman robe! Up goes Gary Poo!

9. First Timothy 6:10 should not read **"the love of money is the root of all evil."** This is much too

broad for a translator or a reviser (or a Greek professor for that matter!) who loves money. Something must be done to prove this verse is in "error." Bob Jones III got rid of it (*NASB*), Wheaton and Moody got rid of it (*NIV*), BBC and the Radio Bible Class got rid of it (*NKJV*), and the Southern Baptist Convention got rid of it (*RSV* and *NSRB*). Surely it must have been an "error"! Surely the intent of the original author was just "a root of all KINDS of evil." Surely! Has to be! "Gotta be, man, gotta be!"

Don't place your bets yet.

You had better exercise an element of caution by now, in view of the fact that the "experts" have just bombed out *eight times in a row* in proving "error" in the *AV* text. Eight out of ten times is eighty percent error. You are about to see NINE out of TEN times—ninety percent error. Ninety percent error in what? In "higher Christian education" as taught by all scholars who go by "plenary, verbally, inspired original autographs."

The text reads "ῥίξα γάρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστιν ἡ φιλαργυρία" in all Greek manuscripts extant of *any* family.

Now for a moment, let us pretend that we are mentally sick and diseased with "Scholarship Onlyism" so we will approach "THE" Greek text with a fever of 105° and a scatterbrained mentality. In this condition, the first thing we will notice is the absence of the "article." There is no article before "ῥίξα" (spelled "rhiza" in the concordances), so how could anyone say **"the root of . . . ."** The next thing we note is that (literally) the word for **"evil"** is plural: "EVILS" (κακῶν). So how could anyone be stupid enough to translate a plural as a *singular?* (Watch your step, stupid, they all do it and do it regularly; see case No. 8 you just studied). Now! Don't we have enough evi-

dence here from "THE" Greek text to condemn the AV reading as an error? No article and one plural. Won't that hold up in court?

Well, no, not if YOU just added Greek articles to I Corinthians 1:31; Matthew 27:54; Mark 15:39; Acts 17:23, 26:6; Hebrews 11:10, 2:12; 1 Thessalonians 4:8; and Luke 1: 17, 32 *where there weren't any.*

A thief who robs nine banks (and is convicted of it) cannot convict a man who robbed ONE. But this doesn't get to the roots (ῥίξα) of the problem. What do the fly-by-night gooney birds (I am speaking with charity of course!) do when Dr. A. T. Robertson, their mentor, says "There is no obligation on anyone to use the Greek article unless he feels the need of it to make something *definite* that is without it" (Robertson, op cit. p. 282).

Does Robertson mean just where the article appears in the text? Oh no! "A root of all kinds of evil is not satisfactory. The position of *hiriza* in the sentence shows that it is emphatic" (*The Expositors Greek New Testament,* Vol, IV, p. 144).

Caught you contradicting your own authorities again, didn't I? You are contradicting the authorities to which you appealed, to contradict the Holy Bible. You have no authority. You *are an anarchist.* Not only Newport White (above), but Fields cites similar examples of the "absence of the article, collected by Wetstein, Athenaeus, and Diogenes . . . ." Fields also adds five more cases like 1 Timothy 6:10. Lewis (*The English Bible from KJV to NIV,* Baker, 1982, pg. 346): "Since the use of the article in Greek does NOT correspond with its use in English, this question is a perplexing one for ALL TRANSLATORS." Do you mean to tell us that a "perplexing problem" that arises because the use of two words are *different* in two languages, comprises *conclusive evidence* that

there is an error in a *King James Bible*? That is exactly what Gary Hudson was trying to tell you. "Tell it to the judge."

A. T. Robertson again: "It is a curious bit of inadvertence when grammarians speak of the 'omission of the Greek article in the New Testament' . . . when there is only ONE such object it is definite *without the article*" (op cit. p. 282).

What happened to the MINDS of the Seminary students and professors who took the BJU, BBC, PCC "stance" against the Book? Easy: *in making money they lost their minds.* If you think the addition of **"the"** before **"root"** is an error, it is because YOU are in error. If you thought **"all evil"** should have been "kinds," you have added to the word of God while hollering about others doing it, while you were in error *yourself.* If you translated literally—and no modern translation (*ASV, NASV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, NKJV, NEB, TEV, NWT,* etc.) translated the passage literally, you would have: "root of all evils is the love of riches."

"KINDS" is not found in the Textus Receptus, the Majority Text, the Eclectic Text, the Alexandrian Text, or any other publication falsely cited as "THE Greek Text."

Ninety percent error—nine out of ten.

This is the product of "Scholarship Onlyism," as taught by the institutions of higher learning in America. This is the RESULT of the "militant stand" taken by Curtis Hutson, Bob Jones Jr., Bob Jones III, Arlin Horton, John Ankerberg, Chuck Swindoll, John McArthur, McCrae, Archer, Willmington, Wemp, Freerkson, Robertson, Wuest, Hindson, Dobson, Hudson, Walker, Combs, Kutilek, Ross, Newman, Farstad, Hodges, and their followers. Shall we see if they are one hundred percent in error? Let's "do it," shall we?

10. **"Easter"** is an impossible translation; it has

to be "PASSOVER" because *"pascha"* can only be translated *one* way (Acts 12:4). This is the standard position of all destructive critics in the Alexandrian Cult. Martin Luther translated "Pascha" as **"Easter"** clear through his New Testament, and even called Jesus Christ "OUR EASTER LAMB" (1 Cor. 5:7). (He thought a "dynamic equivalent" was better than a "formal correspondence!") Now before cutting through the scholastic fog blanket that hangs over Biblical truth, note that all of the Alexandrian collectors—going by a Greek lexicon ALONE ("SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM") failed:

1. To study the *history* of the word "Easter."
2. To stick by one of their own main tenants of modern translating (just mentioned).
3. To read the English text: **"the days of unleavened bread."**
4. To show why Herod would be involved with Easter, instead of a Jewish Passover.
5. To recognize Easter as an established Spring festival in Palestine *before* the time of David (Judg. 2:13; Jer. 44:17).

Suddenly, all of these egotistical critics forgot their "grammatico-historico" literalism and dumped the "historico" part.

Now, understand the task set before the Cult, and understand it thoroughly. What these destructive critics have to prove is NOT that since all of their lexicons say "Passover" this *proves* "*pascha*" cannot be *anything else.* What they have to prove is that the *AV* reading is a definite ERROR because it is IMPOSSIBLE to give "*pascha*" any other translation.

You see, these egotistical hypocrites will always try to smooth over their task to make it look like a "snap." Being pragmatic anarchists, they like to *pretend* that they don't have to prove anything "beyond a

reasonable shadow of a doubt" because that is the Law. Outlaws make up their own laws (*ASV*, *NASV*, *RSV*, *NRSV*, *NIV*, *NKJV*, etc.). They are a rule to themselves (Judg. 21:25; Prov. 16:2).

To see this in action, obtain the video tape on *"The Errors in the King James Bible"* (1990, Bible Baptist Bookstore).

1. The Latin word for *Easter* is *PASCHA* (Watts, *Easter, Its Story and Its Meaning*, pg. 36).

2. A Baptist pastor in Liberty, SC (Raymond Blanton), says Luther was correct on the passage. It should be **"Easter"** here.

3. In Genesis 14, the Babylonians who worshipped ISHTAR (Easter, Ashtoreth, Astarte, etc.) are in Southern Palestine. This is eight hundred years before 2 Samuel 8:13–14, where they show up in *Edom.* Poor old John R. Rice couldn't find the references in a Book he quoted more than one hundred times to prove he had a "GOD-BREATHED BOOK." What was Johnny's trouble? Easy; he attended Baylor and the University of Chicago. That finished him as a *Bible teacher.* There is something about higher Christian education that destroys your ability to READ and THINK. (It must in some strange way be related to television. The two must be "kin folk.")

4. Easter (worship of Astarte, Ashtoreth, Ishtar, etc.) is well established in Palestine as a religion with ceremonial observances BEFORE Gideon was born (see Judg. 2:13).

5. Herod Agrippa I was not a Jew, nor of Jewish stock (*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia,* Vol. III, pp. 1379–1383). He enforced circumcision as an EDOMITE (see above, under Gen. 14:1–5 and 2 Sam. 8:13–14). The Babylonian "EASTER" would have been his main religious day. Herod was not waiting for *anyone to* sacrifice the paschal lamb; *that had already*

taken place. The diseased sufferers (anyone, excepting Luther, in the last ten paragraphs) went just as blind as a bat when they hit the King's English in Acts 12:3, **"Then were the days of unleavened bread."** (I presume it was the "uninspired" parenthesis markings that blew their minds.) No one was waiting for the slaughter of the lamb, for **"the DAYS of unleavened bread"** BEGAN with one day. **"Days"** (all Greek texts extant) show that the Passover was PAST. **"The DAYS of unleavened bread"** are **"seven days"** (Lev. 23:5–6), not THE DAY of the Passover.

If Herod had been waiting for the "*pascha*," in the sense of the Passover lamb, he would have had another 354–359 days to wait. Herod was waiting for *Easter Sunday morning* to pass by—the morning of the resurrection according to all ROMANS (Herod was a Roman), BABYLONIANS (Ishtar was a Babylonian goddess), and EDOMITES (Herod was an Edomite). This would be the first day of the week. **"AFTER"** that, he could bring Peter out and let the Jews decide what to do with him. Technically, he would have to wait till THEIR feast was over also, and it had begun WEDNESDAY. Peter, therefore, was going to be brought forth the next THURSDAY, which would have begun at 6 p.m. Wednesday night.

Thus, it would have been after EASTER (as in "EASTER," spelled E-A-S-T-E-R) *and* after **"the days of unleavened bread."**

The old Roaring English Lion of the Protestant Reformation—the Monarch of the Books—had it right BOTH times. "Scholarship Onlyism" didn't have it right ONCE. The scholars didn't know history and couldn't read their own language and didn't check Leviticus. Par for the course. That is ten out of ten. One hundred percent effort. That is the ultimate result of Christian education in a Fundamental (or Liberal, Catholic,

Neo-Evangelical, or Secular) University or College.

Just as blind as a bat and just as spiritually bankrupt as the College of Cardinals.

In ten attempts to PROVE (did you get that word?) with FACTS (did you get that word?) that the *AV* had genuine ERRORS (did you see THAT word?), the Alexandrian Cult caved in ten times: ten out of ten is one hundred percent.

These are the men (and schools) that have been training young men who were called to preach. These are the men and schools that have been furnishing the churches of America with "ministers" for nearly one hundred years. You can imagine the condition in which the country is now (see *The Damnation* of A *Nation*, 1991) after the spiritual leadership of such a rotten, deluded mass of egotistical yo-yos, whose batting average is .000 after TEN times at the plate. If they threw their bat at the ground, they would miss it too.

Let us make something clear in conclusion. Poor little Gary Hudson was not "picked on" or "pointed out" as any particular "special case." His motives, approach, sources, methods, goals, materials, thinking, and apologetics for humanistic anarchy are absolutely STANDARD in all Christian institutions of "higher learning." He *is not an exception* in the least. To the contrary, he is a cloned representative of nearly five thousand critics exactly like him—identical twins. Gary didn't posit ONE original thought against the *AV* in all ten sample cases. He merely aped the "CREED OF THE CULT" (which, by the way, has been printed twelve times a year for ten years in *The Bible Believers' Bulletin).* All modern apostate Fundamentalists think exactly like Gary Hudson. That is why God put him out of the evangelistic ministry and stacked him on the shelf with the "rejects" (I Cor. 9:27).

Modern Funnymentalists want to replace "KING

JAMES ONLYISM" with "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM." In short, they desire to replace the authority of the Book in your home and your mind, as well as in your church and your school, with the opinions and preferences of bloated egotists whose rate of error is one hundred percent: ten out of ten. Count 'em: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. No knowledge of Greek or Hebrew is necessary to correct them. No knowledge of archaeology or the Dead Sea Scrolls is necessary. No knowledge of Form, Source, or Structural Criticism is necessary. There is no need to study Koine or Attic Greek, or the culture of the Graeco-Roman world. To discover THE TRUTH, no one needs to take Manuscript Evidence, Textual Criticism, Redaction, or Canonical Criticism. In order to correct ALL of the scholars who promote "SCHOLARSHIP ONLYISM," all that is needed is ONE BOOK, a humble mind, and a believing heart. That will "do the trick."

Only ONE BOOK ("King James Onlyism" is the deceptive vocabulary of the Bible corrupters at Bob Jones and PCC) is necessary to critique any translation from ANY set of manuscripts, or any scholar who criticizes the *AV*. Get one while you can, for there is underway a movement—which has been underway since 1880—to get this ONE BOOK off the face of the earth, while "USING IT" (in some circles) as bait to lead you to one hundred percent error: *"Scholarship Onlyism."*

EPILOGUE

THE DEAD AIR SPACES

Many long years ago, I was, among other things, a commercial radio announcer. Among many of the things we had to do as "DJs" would be to "cue up" records on a "Gates Console" and then hold them with our fingers until the "introduction" was made. We would then release our fingers off the record, and if you had it cued in properly, there was no "dead air" between the announcement (*"Here, now, is Peggy Lee!"*) and the first note of the music. If the record was miscued it would "wow"; that is, if you had turned it too far around. If it was not turned around far enough, there would be "dead air" space between the announcement and the piece. When a DJ miscued a record, we called this a "fluff," and we had a "fluff box" on the console where each DJ had to contribute twenty-five cents to a "slush fund." That is what we used to buy new records. *The "fluff" box never lacked money.*

Now, the Bible student who tends to get swept off his feet with all of the "documented facts" presented by the Christian scholars, needs to notice two drastic DEAD AIR spaces right in the middle of supposedly objective and scholarly approaches. First of all, however, he should observe the mass of material accumulated by those who want to nullify the power and authority of the English Protestant Reformation text. The radical fanaticism with which apostate Fundamentalists and dead orthodox Conservatives arm themselves, defies a comparison in secular history, unless it would

be something like the Marian Cult giving Fatima credit for Russia breaking down economically, or Himmler going through his Wotan-Thor rites for the elite SS leaders, or perhaps, Adolph himself haranguing the crowds at Nuremberg and the Berlin Sportspalast. But even these demonstrations are mild to the zeal and efforts displayed by Strouse, Waite, Pickering, Hodges, Farstad, Dell, Martin, Duncan, Combs, Sherman, Ross, Hudson, and others, when it comes to their desire to tear a *Book* out of your hands and make you rely on *them* and *their friends* for your authority.

I am not "whistling Dixie." I have the material right here in my office and in my home. In the last one hundred years (and especially in the last thirty years), the Alexandrian Cult has "outdone" themselves so many times you wouldn't think they would have enough breath left to blow a gnat off their noses. You talk about "all-out efforts" and "total commitment"!

No martyr or missionary to the foreign field was ever as anxious and as zealous and as completely "sold out" as these people are to one objective: *getting rid of one Book.* That Book is NOT the *RSV* or *NASV*. It is not the *Textus Receptus* or *Nestle's* text. It is NOT the *Majority Text* or the *ASV*, and it is NOT the *NRSV* or the *NIV*. It is the 1611 product of the English Protestant Reformation, the Book that built America and England before they gave it up and consequently deteriorated.

Examine the effort; look at the "impact" of the "total thrust" (to cite the NEA and the news media).

1. You must abandon the Book because it is *archaic* and uses language that no longer "communicates" to a "pluralistic society." It can no longer "reach out" and "touch" the common man. Update it. So they did, *one hundred and twenty* times since 1880, and still say it needs to be "updated." (I read this hoary alibi

given by Doug Kutilek in a paper printed in 1991, after all one hundred and twenty updatings were on the market.)

2. You must abandon the Book because of its poor scholarship compared to the highly scientific methods of scholarship today, due to "latest finds" and "recent discoveries" which give "new light" on THE Greek and THE Hebrew. This is followed by a list of archaeological finds, none of which give any light on the Scriptures at all, but only deal with what someone *thinks* a word should mean if it is judged by the "find" instead of by the Scriptures themselves.

3. You must abandon the Book because it came from inferior "late" manuscripts, and the *AV* translators didn't have access to *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus,* which are "nearer the originals." This is still "current" in 1992, after it has been shown on more than *two dozen* occasions that the *AV* translators had access to every reading in *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* that the *RV, ASV, NASV, RSV, NRSV,* and *NIV* adopted.

You talk about "sticktoitiveness"! Talk about "persistence"! Many of the very men who say the three things above, and swear by them, still insist on USING this corrupt, archaic, inferior translation to make a living.

4. You must abandon the Book because King James was associated with it, and he was an anti-Puritan, anti-Baptist, tennis-playing homosexual. And this information is given out without a peep about the documented facts found in Bingham's *The Making of a King;* Fraser's *King James IV of Scotland;* McElwee's *The Wisest Fool in Christendom;* or Robinson's *Original Letters Relative to the Reformation.* The alibi given above is current in 1991 and 1992, just like it was in 1881 and 1882, with a total dead

space following the attacks. Dead air. *Someone has miscued a record.*

Notice how "dead air spaces" are found throughout all of the works by Catholic historians when writing any kind of history. A statement is made like "The anti-Catholics came to be known as the 'Know Nothings'," and then no explanation is given—dead air. "Some fanatics were afraid the Jesuits would destroy the public school system." Yes? And *then?* So . . . ? So nothing: dead air. "Ruckman teaches there will be no women in Heaven." And of course there will be? Oh, there *won't* be? Oh, I see: dead air. "Ruckman teaches five plans of salvation." Shocking! What are they? You are going to discuss them, aren't you? Sorry, *dead air.*

5. You must abandon the Book because Spurgeon, Torrey, and Criswell said it had errors in it, and they weren't just dead, barren, powerless apostates like Zane Hodges, James Price, and Wilbur Pickering; they were "soulwinners." Then there is not even a HINT that you should commit adultery like David or murder someone like Moses did, because they were more godly than Spurgeon, Torrey, or Criswell. Moses has a position at the right hand of Jesus Christ that was denied to James and John.

6. You must abandon the Book because it is not a true 1611 version but was revised several times, so that you do not have the words of the "original." How could any Book be inerrant when all of the WORDS don't match? And then there follows a long, dead air space in which you could read the Gettysburg Address. Not one mention of two supposedly "verbally inspired" accounts where one has revised the other in two dozen places (Psa. 18 and 2 Sam 22), and yet *BOTH* are supposed to be inspired. There is not one peep about Jeremiah 36, where a *second* inspired account ("double inspiration") made *additions* to the first inspired account.

Blank spaces. Dead air. You encounter it time and time again. Not once in thirty years of polemics against the *AV*, and apologetics for "Scholarship Onlyism," has an Alexandrian faced these *two issues* which were put before him back in 1960. The inspired account that John wrote, does NOT match word-for-word the one that Matthew wrote, nor does his match Luke's or Mark's. Pharaoh's verbal pronouncements were certainly NOT in Hebrew, and any attempt to translate them (as Moses certainly did) would NOT have given you a "verbally inspired" report.

7. You must abandon the Book. Do you see how INTENSIVE this thing is? Do you see how dead-set these egotists are in getting that Book not only out of your *hands* but out of your *mind?* You must now abandon the Book—that is, if you haven't already on the other six charges—because translations on the mission field in another tongue don't match it word for word, so it couldn't be inerrant or absolutely correct. The logical thing with which to follow up here would be a discussion of Pentecost, where anywhere from seven to twelve foreign *languages were* inspired by the Holy Ghost—if you are to believe 2 Peter 1:21. But no discussion follows. Dead air. More silence. Fifth Amendment "scholars." They can only handle the negative, destructive "facts" that line up with their Nicolaitan position. They are absolutely senile and sterile when faced with Scriptural fact. Acts 2 is Scripture.

8. But "Never say die," "Don't give up the ship," "We have only begun to fight," "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead," etc. You see, the determination of these apostates would give a pit bull "a run for his money." They are absolutely resolved to the proposition that you are NOT to believe *that Book* and accept it as God's final authority in your life. You are absolutely obligated to believe *them* and their *opinions* and

preferences as Scriptural truth, even though they do not match what you find WRITTEN in the Scriptures (say Psa. 18; 2 Sam. 22; Jer. 36; and Acts 2, for example).

Now, if you have not had your faith in the Book shaken to your boot straps, you must admit that you will have to abandon the Book because the *Apocrypha* was stuck between the Testaments, whereas you cannot find it stuck between the Testaments in the *ASV, NASV,* and *NIV*. And . . . ? And nothing. Dead air. Not one mention of the fact that the Apocrypha is inserted into the Old Testament Canon as part of the INSPIRED account in the Greek "Septuagints" used for the *RV, ASV, NASV, NAV, RSV, NRSV,* and *NIV;* and not one peep about the fact that the *AV* translators did NOT include one book in it as part of the Canon. They placed it (as Luther and others did) *between* the two inspired testaments. But this is never reported by an apostate. You can count on him every time (from 1901 to 1992) to report it as "the *King James* translators published the Apocrypha as part of THE BIBLE." I have seen that standard lie repeated (and in print) *more than forty times since 1970.* Someone is determined that you should abandon that Book and accept HIM as your authority, and it isn't "Ruckman."

9. You must abandon that Book, otherwise you are a "Jesuit plant" trying to lead Baptists back to Rome. (This is the craziness of Bob Ross, a Hard-Shell, five-point, TULIP Calvinist who thought Baptist Bible College should be "IMMERSIONIST Bible College" and Vick's Detroit "Baptist Temple" should have been "The Detroit *Immersionist* Temple.") The idea is that if you approve of the *AV,* you are deceiving people about the "mode" of baptism. Ross thinks John the Baptist was "John the Immersionist." Curtis Hutson backed this up in *The Sword of the Lord* and accused

the *AV* of a "BLASPHEMOUS" mistranslation which could not possibly have been the work of the Holy Spirit.

Nonetheless, the Campus Church (PCC, Arlin and Becky Horton) lists itself in the phone book in 1991 as a *Baptist* church—not an "immersionist" church. In their case, it doesn't make a great deal of difference, because the Campus Church is an *interdenominational* "chapel."

Did you ever see such an effort made to attain ANY goal? Napoleon's invasion of Russia or Japan's invasion of China and Malaya couldn't compare with it. This is no little five or six year "planned program" like World War II, or any little rinky dinky affair like planning the D-Day beach landings in Normandy. This is "the real thing." This is an all-out, one-hundred-year effort to get rid of ONE BOOK. Hitler only spent twelve years in getting rid of one race; he was an amateur alongside Hort, Schaff, Bob Jones III, Sproule, James Price, A. T. Robertson, Kenneth Wuest, F. F. Bruce, Bruce Metzger, and Robert Sumner.

10. The last attempt to scare you (or ridicule you) into throwing away the greatest Book the world has ever seen in print—bar none—goes like this: "Didn't the Catholics back in the Dark Ages say that a translation (*Jerome's Vulgate*) was superior to the original languages from which it was translated? If anyone had believed this, Martin Luther and others could have never brought about a Reformation, for they went back to the *original languages.* If you believe the *AV* is superior to the copies of copies—containing copyists' errors!—you are a *Catholic* and lining up with Rome and pretending that you are a Protestant."

Yes? And *then?* And what then?

I have seen this stupid, simplistic, lying alibi in print in ten "Fundamental" periodicals, and I have re-

ceived it on four cassette tapes where faculty members were trying to destroy the faith of their student body in the Book. I also have the same corrupt charge in seven letters written to me by the fanatics in the Alexandrian Cult, as they raged and foamed at the mouth, trying to maintain "lordship" over the " laity" in the Body of Christ.

Not once on any tape or in any letter or in any periodical was I given the following information which deals with the charge. It has been omitted twenty-one times. That is enough dead air space to write a thesis on *"How to Lose Your Marbles at Grace Theological Seminary."*

A. A *Catholic* trusting a translation from the Alexandrian manuscripts from which the *ASV, NIV,* and *NASV* came is not the same as a *Protestant trusting* a translation from manuscripts that were rejected by ALL official Roman Catholic translations (*Douay, Douay Rheims, Challoner, Challoner Rheims, New Jerusalem, New American,* etc.).

B. You were handed a loose rope that is untied at both ends. You were given the distinct impression—which is just as wicked as hell—that if you believe your Protestant Reformation text, you will be responsible for keeping people in darkness like the Pope kept them in the Dark Ages; whereas, if you give up your Protestant Reformation Bible and accept the Jerome's Latin *Vulgate* again (in the form of Greek manuscripts), you will bring about a revival and a *reformation,* as Luther did.

This is the work of Donald Waite, Stewart Custer, Professor Strouse, Wilbur Pickering, Zane Hodges, Arthur Farstad, Bob Jones III, and anyone else STUPID enough to think they were honest men who would deal with the "facts." The *substitution* of the right set of Greek manuscripts (Textus Receptus and Majority)

for the *wrong* set (the ones recommended by Bob Jones III and every faculty of every major Christian school in America between 1901 and 1983) doesn't accomplish anything, for when this was done *(NKJV,* 1983), the Catholic *ASV, NASV, RSV, NRSV,* and *NIV* readings in English *are inserted back into the* text.

C. By bringing the charge of "pro-Catholic" against every anti-Catholic, Bible-believing Protestant left on this earth, the apostates above (plus the whole Cult: Combs, Price, Ron Walker, James Melton, Homer Duncan, Robert Sumner, Doug Kutilek, Gary Hudson, Hot Dog Hymers, et al.) are actually trying to sell you (you wouldn't believe this unless you had my correspondence!) on the idea that there will be a reformation and spiritual revival like the one that took place at the time of Luther, if you just get rid of the *AV* as your final authority and "go back" to a language that God shelved seventeen hundred years ago: a language which THE APOSTATES think they have mastered well enough to use as a bludgeon and an A-bomb over your head if you won't give up YOUR BOOK.

D. Not *one* man in the group (or any *combination of* any ten men in the group) which translated the *NKJV* (from the "Receptus") could bring a revival or awakening to a town of two thousand people. And *if* they used "the original languages" on the grounds that it was still a living language, God Almighty would pay no more attention to their preaching than if they were using the *Koran* as a textbook.

But nothing was said about these matters. You were left hanging in air—dead air. Hanging in space—dead space. Not one word about the total LACK of reformation and revival that followed ANY English translations published in the last one hundred years, and not *one word* about every major soulwinning work (and every major soulwinning preacher) in America

and England being forced by the Holy Spirit to do the work with ONE BOOK, and it was not in the "original languages."

To this day—after one hundred years of radical, fanatical, destructive attacks on the Book—many of those who use the arguments above still have to play the hypocrite and pretend that it is "the Word of God." They have to USE it without *believing* it, and that is what everyone of them does who is actually carrying out any kind of New Testament evangelism, soul-winning, church planting, or missionary efforts. But not one word about these matters when talking about believing that Jerome's *Latin Vulgate* was superior to the copies of copies—containing copyists' errors—from which it came. Not a peep.

But we have saved the greatest vacuum for the last. Here is a black hole into which you could cram the Library of Congress. To tell the truth, with more than twenty-three million books in the Library of Congress, you cannot find ONE book—I said "ONE" book—that has the following information in it. You talk about a "dead space" or checking "headspace" on a machinegun bolt! Here is an air pocket in the theology and practice of the apostate Fundamentalists that could house downtown Manhattan and Chicago at one time.

After one hundred years of what you read above, after one hundred years of stretching the mind and human ingenuity to the breaking point, after one hundred years of inventing and citing every possible detailed item they could muster up, the whole body of "godly scholars"—including all the men listed above, plus Knowling, Blass, Hackett, Rendall, Nicoll, Kittel, Willmington, Wemp, Freerkson, McCrae, Newman, John R. Rice, Broadus, Carroll, Bob Jones Jr., Curtis Hutson, John Ankerberg, R. B. Thieme Jr., and Chuck

Swindoll—forgot to tell you WHO it was that first planted a doubt in their mind about the infallibility and inerrancy of the Book they spent their lifetime attacking, while "USING" it.

What a fantastic "omission"! Here is all of this negative, destructive garbage being dumped on young men through *five generations* (see the details on how it is done and where it is done in *How to Teach the "Original" Greek Text,* 1992), and not one trace of any "apostolic line" that corrupted *five generations* of people who held to "historic positions" about the Scripture! Not a peep. All is as quiet as a turkey farm on Thanksgiving afternoon. This evidently was the perfect crime.

Whoever implanted doubt (see Gen. 3:1) in the minds of John R. Rice, Curtis Hutson, and Bob Jones III about the *AV—after* they were saved by *believing* it—got off "scot-free." He came and went undetected. No one ever identified him. Either through the fear of ridicule or the desire to present a good image, not one saved Baptist scholar in America, for one hundred years, ever dared to identify the "punk" in the "lineup" that destroyed his faith in the Book. On this one, the policemen on the "beat," the detectives, the criminals, the grafters, the ward heelers, the junkies, prostitutes, police lieutenants, and lawyers were all in "cahoots." They agreed that the criminal was NOT to be identified under ANY circumstances.

"And now here is Artie Shaw and his orchestra playing 'Back Bay Shuffle'!" Silence. More silence. *Dead air.* You miscued the record. That will be twenty-five cents in the "fluff box." In this case, you owe somewhere around $500,000,000,000,000,000,000 for destroying the lives and ministries of over five thousand young men.

"And now here is the Greek teacher and College

professor who first planted a doubt in my mind about Romans 8:1 and Acts 12:4!"

Silence. More silence. *Dead air.* Dead air from a dead-head. Silence from a *lying hypocrite* who doesn't have the manhood or the guts to give credit where credit is due (Gen. 3:1).

I can tell you who planted the first doubt in MY mind about the Book. It *was Satan,* the night I publicly professed Jesus Christ as my Saviour. I can tell you who the second one was. It was *Fred Afman* at BJU (now teaching at Tennessee Temple). I can tell you who the third one was. It was *Daniel Krushek* at BJU, and the fourth one was *Dr. Charles Brokenshire,* a five-point, TULIP Calvinist teaching at Bob Jones.

You won't find me at all "skittish" when it comes to "naming names." I am interested in every born-again young man on this earth (who is called to preach) knowing WHERE, WHEN, HOW, and by WHOM his faith in the Book is going to be destroyed. The fifth man who tried to steal that blessed Book from me was *Dr. William Brunner,* a private pupil of *Dr. A. T. Robertson;* he also taught at BJU. After that, the opponents became "legion." John Rice messed with the Book where he couldn't understand or didn't agree with it (see Rev. 22:14 for example). Curtis Hutson messed with it, Cliff Robinson (TTU) messed with it, Sumner Wemp messed with it (LU), the pastor of the Campus Church (PCC) messed with it, J. Vernon McGee messed with it, Charlie Fuller corrected it.

When I began to write my first book, *The Bible Babel,* I ran into the Scholars' Union full force. Everyone of them had been converted from a *Bible-believer* into an *infidel* by someone just like them who had stolen their Bible from them. Their only claim to "fidelity" was that some of them believed the Apostles' Creed—as do all Catholic Popes—and others believed

that somewhere, sometime, in an unknown way, God had somebody write something that *no man has ever seen,* and this lost pile of scattered papers was the final authority in all matters of faith and practice for "THE BELIEVER." Did you get that last word? Can you imagine it? It absolutely defies the imagination.

And so it is today that these fanatics keep up with their enraged and furious attacks against a Book that "discerns the thoughts and intents of their hearts." They will keep it up till the Advent. These foaming, slobbering, irrational rantings and ravings (notice that all are neatly *disguised* as cool, courteous, scholarly "objections") will go right on into Daniel's Seventieth Week after the Rapture, for in the Tribulation the universal language is NOT Greek; it is *ENGLISH.*

FOOTNOTES

1. A xerox photocopy showing the names of the men on this "Overview" committee can be purchased at the Bible Baptist Bookstore in Pensacola. Curtis Hutson's name appears on *the same page* with the founder of Neo-Evangelicalism, which the "Sword" pretends to stand against. Along with Harold Ockenga will be found outstanding Southern Baptist leaders *in the Convention.*

2. *New Testament Criticism and Interpretation,* Black and Dockery, Zondervan Pub. House, 1991, pg. 45.

3. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible,* Grant and Tracy, Fortress Pub. Philadelphia, 1984, pg. 55.

4. Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 45.

5. *History of the New Testament Church,* Vol. 1, Ruckman, 1982, pg. 105.

6. Black and Dockery, ibid.

7. *On Interpretation* (Thomas Aquinas), translated by Oesterle (Milwaukee, Marquette Univ. Press, 1962).

8. *Erasmus and the New Testament,* A. Rabil, San Antonio, Trinity Univ. Press, 1972, pp. 43–45.

9. Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 47.

10. Arpninius, *A Study in the Dutch Reformation,* C. Bangs, Abington Press, 1971, pp. 1878–288.

11. Black and Dockery, op cit. pp. 53–55.

12. See the article on "Texual Criticism" by Dr. Michael Holmes for example (he got his Ph.D. from Princeton). It is found in Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 108. For an analysis of this chart, examine pages i, 202–210 in *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Schol-*

arship, Ruckman (Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1990).

13. Dr. Kyle Snodgrass writing on *The Use of the Old Testament in the New* in Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 424.

14. Dr. Scot McKnight, whose conclusions are drawn from reading *The Two Source Hypothesis* by A. J. Bellinzoni (Mercer University Press, 1985), Synopsis Quarterly, Aland (531-549) and *The Order of the Synoptics,* Orchard and Riley, Mercer University Press, 1987).

15. Scot McKnight, again, making the observation after studying K. Aland, A. Huck, H. Greeven, J. C. B. Mohr, B. Orchard, and R. W. Funk.

16. Notice that this false expression is used by Curtis Hutson when justifying his corrections on the *AV*; it is used constantly by Bob Jones III and Stewart Custer, Wuest and Robertson, Ankerberg and Neal, Panosian and Combs, Wisdom and Afman, Willmington and Freerkson, Wemp and F. F. Bruce, and Meredith Kline and any other destructive critic who sits in judgment on the *Authorized Version.* It is standard LIE, which all LIARS use.

17. *Light From the Greek New Testament,* Blackwelder cited on pg. 435 (*Christian's Handbook,* op cit.).

18. Ibid, citing pg. 30 of Blackwelder's work.

19. Ibid, pg. 51, op cit, citing pg. 51 of Blackwelder.

20. Op cit, citing Blackwelder, pp. 72 and 106.

21. *The Practical Use of The Greek New Testament,* Kenneth Wuest (Moody Press 1946, pp. 23, 69).

22. Op. cit., pg. 51.

23. Snodgrass' amazing ignorance at this point is justified by the following: "Deuteronomy 18:15 refers to PROPHETS IN GENERAL" (Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 430). There are no *prophets* in Deuteronomy

18:15. Every Hebrew text on earth said *"a prophet."* Snodgrass pulled a famous Alexandrian gimmick to knock Jesus Christ out of Deuteronomy. He "contexted" the prophecy out of existence by running to verse 20.

24. Snodgrass, op cit., pg. 416.
25. Snodgrass, op cit., pg. 417.
26. Ibid.
27. Op cit. pg. 423.
28. Dr. (Doctoress or Person) Aida Spencer, cited in Black and Dockery, op cit. pg. 228.
29. Op cit. pg. 231.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Op cit. pg. 243. Here your Doctoress justifies her emasculation of the doctrines on prayer in the passage by saying that "understanding the richness of many New Testament passages can be increased by analyzing to what degree a metaphor is developed."
35. *Perspectives on the Parables,* Mary Ann Tolbert (Fortress Pub., Phil, 1979) pp. 34–50.
36. Ibid.
37. Tolbert, op cit. pg. 109.
38. Op cit. pg. 444.
39. Op cit. pg. 449.
40. Op cit. pg. 457.
41. Ibid.
42. Op cit. pg. 475.
43. Op cit. pg. 489.
44. When all the material was assembled, every atlas constructed on a century of "finds" (*The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible, The McMillan Bible Atlas,* and ALL the atlases published by Baker Book House, Zondervan, Eerdnians, and Thomas Nel-

son and Sons) shows Israel going *around* the Red Sea instead of *crossing* it.

45. *Funk and Wagnalls New Encyclopedia,* Vol. II, edited by Bram and Dickey, 1966, pg. 259.

46. Ibid.

47. Op cit. pg. 257.

48. Op cit. pg. 247

48a. Op cit. Vol. 4, pg. 58.

49. Op cit. pg. 59.

50. *The Truth About the King James Controversy,* Bob Jones University Press, 1981, pg. 19.

51. Op cit, pg. 18.

52. Op cit, pg. 19. *Observe that deliberate lying and falsification* of facts plus omission of facts is condoned by Bob Jones Jr. and Bob Jones III when dealing with the "ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE," although this is how these gentlemen advertise their University!

They will pay a liar to protect them from the authority of the Authorized Version.

(The remainder of the references for footnotes have been included in the body of the text with their source references. This was done because the last 22–24 pages of this work are so important for the reader in seeing the DEMENTIA in the "Scholarship Onlyism" position that we gave the *references* right beside the author's opinion.)



Dr. Peter S. Ruckman
B.A., B.D., M.A., Th.M., Ph.D.

Dr. Ruckman, President and Founder of Pensacola Bible Institute, has been teaching Biblical languages for over forty-seven years. He has also authored over one hundred books, booklets, and commentaries; including extensive research for works in *Manuscript Evidence* and *Church History.* He graduated from Bob Jones University in 1958, earning his Doctorate in Philosophy. Since that time, he has exposed the fraud and duplicity that is in contemporary higher Christian education. *King James Onlyism versus Scholarship Onlyism* joins a long list of works that deal with this subject in an accurate and comprehensive manner.

ISBN 1-58026-083-7 RK-100
50000
9 781580 260831